21943

NATIONAL LIBRARY
OTTAWA

CANADA

BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE
OTTAWA

NAME OF AUTHOR. Chrystyna T. PRYNADA-DEMIDENKO

TITLE OF THESIS. MARKO VOVCHOK IN RUSSIAN LITERARY CRITICISM OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

UNIVERSITY. UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED. M.A.

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED. 1974

Permission is hereby granted to THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed). Chrystyna T. Prynada-Demidenko

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

9 Robert St.
So. River, New Jersey
08882

DATED. Oct. 10 1974

NL-91 (10-68)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

MARKO VOVCHOK IN RUSSIAN LITERARY CRITICISM OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

by

CHRYSTYNA T. PRYNADA-DEMIDENKO

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF SLAVIC LANGUAGES

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1974

© Chrystyna T. Prynada-Demidenko 1975

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Marko Vovchok in Russian Literary Criticism of the Nineteenth Century" submitted by Chrystyna T. Prynada-Demidenko in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Oleh Zuyewskyj
Supervisor

M. Gluntsan

Tom M. S. Priestley

Edward Mozejko

Date October 3, 1974

ABSTRACT

Marko Vovchok's stories and novels, written in Ukrainian and Russian on the eve of the peasant emancipation and during the turbulent post-reformative years, often formed the basis for different social and political exposés rather than becoming the object of precise literary studies. This was largely due to the fact that Russian literary criticism of that time was predisposed to those views which tended to reveal current social problems.

Apart from these circumstances, Russian critics, who wrote in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, were significantly influenced by the new literary movements, and as a result, were very critical of a writer who continued to write in the realist manner.

The aim of this thesis is to present diverse critical responses by the Russian critics to Marko Vovchok's works which have not been totally examined before and which, to this day, remain dissipated throughout nineteenth century magazines. These, together with selected opinions of the authors who were Marko Vovchok's contemporaries, give us a valuable portrait and evaluation of a multilingual writer and, at the same time, allow us to view the complex structure of Russian literary criticism and its strong influence on Russian literature.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. O. Zujewskyj for his persistent guidance in writing this thesis and to Dr. G. Schaarschmidt for his patience, understanding and valuable suggestions. I am very much indebted to Mrs. L. Taschuk, who performed innumerable clerical duties. My special thanks are due, also, to my husband, Serge, for his help and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION: THE LITERARY CAREER OF MARKO VOVCHOK	1
II.	RUSSIAN SCHOOLS OF CRITICISM IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY	18
III.	RUSSIAN CRITICISM OF MARKO VOVCHOK'S WORKS	30
IV.	MARKO VOVCHOK IN RUSSIAN AND UKRAINIAN LITERATURES	63
V.	CONCLUSION	71
	A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	74

NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION

Except for the well-known names used in the text, the Russian and Ukrainian names, titles of stories and names of literary magazines are transliterated in accordance with the system outlined in A Guide for the Writing of the M.A. and Ph.D. Theses, printed by the Department of Slavic Languages, The University of Alberta, February 28, 1972. Also, the titles of Marko Vovchok's stories are cited in Ukrainian if they were originally written in Ukrainian, and in Russian if they were originally written in Russian.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: THE LITERARY CAREER OF MARKO VOVCHOK

Mariia Oleksandrivna Vilins'ka, known by her pen-name Marko Vovchok, was one of the realist writers who published simultaneously in more than one language. Known as a first-rate author in Ukrainian literature, Marko Vovchok wrote also in Russian and French. Her literary legacy, which includes children's fairytales, short stories about peasant life, novels that describe the life of the upper classes, and numerous translations into Russian from French and English, casts some light on the life of this versatile writer who wrote mostly in the third quarter of the nineteenth century. This was the time when the Imperial Government was making attempts to introduce social and political reforms, and much of the Russian intelligentsia was actively participating in the realization of this goal. Many writers, publishers, and educated people in general, wanted to contribute their time and efforts to such an important period in Russian history.

We have chosen to discuss the topic of literary criticism of Marko Vovchok's works for two important reasons. First of all, we are interested in Marko Vovchok as a realist writer, both in Ukrainian and Russian literature, and we believe that our work makes a significant contribution to the study of Marko Vovchok because we are making available for the first time in English a specific study of this author and have synthesized the most varied and the most interesting critical material about Marko Vovchok. The few existing Ukrainian studies about

the author afford only marginal information in this respect, because almost exclusively they tend to emphasize Marko Vovchok's position in Ukrainian literature and fail to discuss her Russian writing. Secondly, the appearance of Marko Vovchok's stories and novels frequently resulted in varied reviews, including social and political exposés, modest literary evaluations, and spirited esthetic debates between various critics. Thus, in studying these critiques, we are given an opportunity to see different schools of criticism in the second half of the nineteenth century--from the utilitarian social criticism to that of "art for art's sake"--and to witness heated debates which attempted to stress their individual importance in Russian belles-lettres.

Marko Vovchok's literary career began with the publication of a collection of Ukrainian short stories called Narodni opovidannia (Folk Tales). In these tales the author described the arduous life of the serfs and their desire for freedom. Because of their popular theme preceding the serf emancipation and their artistic qualities, Marko Vovchok was generally well received by the critics. Encouraged by her supporters who wished to see similar stories in print in the Russian language, and restricted by the Tsarist censorship which placed great limits on Ukrainian writers and publications to write and print in Ukrainian, Marko Vovchok began to publish in Russian magazines. However, for many reasons, which shall be discussed in this thesis, her popularity in Russian literature was never equal to the one she enjoyed in Ukrainian literature. Despite this, Marko Vovchok's works were frequently the reason behind many Russian critical reviews of mixed persuasions.

In this thesis we will present diverse critical reviews of

Marko Vovchok's literary works and will demonstrate how different factors affected her career and her importance within Russian and Ukrainian literatures. Despite the fact that Marko Vovchok wrote in Russian as well as in Ukrainian, the greatest number of critical responses was directed at her first Ukrainian collection, namely, Narodni opovidannia. Within a short period of time, about thirty reviews appeared in print. However, trying not to become repetitious, we have chosen to study the most varied and the most interesting reviews because others appear redundant and offer little, if any, new information. In examining these critiques we are able to investigate the literary career of the author and the multilateral construction of Russian criticism.

The historical approach which we are using in our work made it necessary to give some additional, but nevertheless, important material, which would clarify the conditions during which Marko Vovchok worked and which compelled her to write in Russian rather than allowing her to develop her Ukrainian prose. Hence, in talking about the anti-Ukrainian policies of Alexander II in Chapter II, we mention the closing of the Sunday schools and the suspension of the publication of Ukrainian books for general education. This limitation of Ukrainian cultural activities had a significant affect on Marko Vovchok's career, for she was compelled to write in the Russian language. Also, in Chapter IV, in describing Marko Vovchok's popularity, we must mention the Ukrainian writers O. Honchar, I. Le, and Iu. Fed'kovych, who were influenced by her and who considered her one of the most prominent literary figures. In addition, the biographical details of the author's life, including the close concentration on her early career in Chapter I, are imperative because

her life had a strong influence on her stories and novels and, consequently, on the critical responses to them. For example, Marko Vovchok deliberately spent many years observing the life of the peasants, the townspeople, and the upper classes and then faithfully reproduced it in her work. In addition, during the early years of her literary career, Marko Vovchok established herself as a realist writer, and this, too, was important for the critics who either valued this trend in her work or rejected it as being unimportant. Furthermore, in order to facilitate the reader's understanding of the reasons for some of the critiques and their respective judgments, it is essential to review briefly in Chapter II the Russian schools of criticism, their most important tenets, and their leading representatives. By the same token, Chapter IV is necessary to illustrate the similarity between the Russian critics in the last decades of the nineteenth century and the Ukrainian critics of the same period. Russian critics tended to view Marko Vovchok's more consistent realist works as outdated while their predecessors, who adhered to the principles of Realism, praised her truthful portrayal of life. Conversely, the Ukrainian critics were still under the influence of Romanticism, and Marko Vovchok's realist stories and novels had no place in their studies. Both the Russian and Ukrainian critics placed demands on the author whose world-view was different from theirs and thus very often undervalued her importance in literature. It was not until much later that the Ukrainian critics began to appreciate Marko Vovchok on the basis of her talent and not according to the negative views of such critics as P. Kulish.

Many Russian literary works written in the nineteenth century

were based on numerous enthnographic studies which were readily available to the public and which continued to dominate the list of publications. The growing interest in folk art (narodnoe tvorchestvo) was the result of a sincere desire to learn about the life of the common people, and at the same time offered numerous material for populist aspirations, such as raising the social and moral conditions of the simple people with the aid of national literature. This observation is particularly valid in our study of Marko Vovchok's literary production (as well as her contribution to the development of Ukrainian literature).

The increase of folkloristic studies and ethnography was inspired by and gained its impetus from the romantic movement and its interest in the past, and the common man: his life, culture, and language. Regarded at first as historical evidence whenever original documents were absent, folkloristic material was soon collected for its literary value. Among multiple compilations of Russian songs and epos the most famous are the collections of Kirsha Danilov. In the 1830's and 1840's, folkloristic studies and the publication of different collections came under the tutelage of the Slavophiles and the Westernists, both of whom used this material to propagate and stress their convictions and theories. Thus, it was a particular interest in folk poetry, as well as the influx of foreign literature into Russia (namely English, French, and German), which were responsible for the literary and the ethnographic pursuits of many Russian authors. I. Turgenev, for example, who was already in his early writings a staunch realist, was greatly interested in ethnography and the language and poetry of the common people. In fact, his collection Zapiski okhotnika (Sportsman's

Sketches) was based on the author's observation of the peasants' work and leisure.[1] Throughout his life, Turgenev watched closely all new publications and collections which described the customs of the people and encouraged his friends and acquaintances to compile them whenever possible. Turgenev, himself, continued to observe all folk activities, particularly singing and dancing, and his later novels and stories reflect his ardent interest in presenting his observations of them within his works.

These same interests in folklore, which influenced many Russian writers, also existed among Ukrainian writers such as Marko Vovchok. In 1818, there appeared a Ukrainian grammar of A. Pavlovskii which contained a brief reference to the importance of folklore in the development of national literature. The subsequent Russian collections of V. Trutovskii, M. Chulkov, and I. Prach and N. L'vov contained many Ukrainian entries. As Professor M. Azadovskii postulates, it was lack of political protest on the part of Ukrainian nobles and their cult of the Cossack dumy (ballads), their general interest in the Cossack past, which were instrumental in producing these numerous collections. Some collectors of folklore, such as P. Lukashevych (1809-1887), were convinced that Ukrainian popular poetry was on the verge of perishing and should be preserved; others, such as M. A. Maksimovich (1804-1873), stated that all these collections were the result of a greater awareness of the value of narodnost' (national character).[2]

---

[1] T. K. Ornatskaia, "Fol'kloristicheskie interesy Turgeneva," Turgenevskii sbornik: Materialy k polnomu sobraniiu sochinenii i pisem I. S. Turgeneva (Leningrad: Nauka, 1968), Vol. IV, pp. 240-242.

[2] M. K. Azadovskii, Istoriia russkoi fol'kloristiki (Moskva:

The center of all this activity in the late 1820's was the University of Kharkov with its prominent representatives, L. Borovykovs'kyi, I. Roskovshenko, I. I. Sreznevskii, and later, V. Passek. Their first principal publication was Ukrainskii al'manakh (The Ukrainian Almanac, 1831), which contained many works devoted to the study of the local past. From the biographical evidence about Marko Vovchok (born Mariia Oleksandrivna Vilins'ka, 1833-1907), we know that she spent some time at a boarding school in Kharkov, and it was in this city that the young girl obtained her more extensive impressions of the people, their language, and their customs. In fact, E. Brandis, in his monograph Marko Vovchok, speculates that in Kharkov, despite stringent regimentation of the boarding school, young Mariia was able to visit the home of the landowner Khrushchov, a friend of the family. These visits which introduced Mariia to the Kharkov University students who were frequent visitors there, as well as a somewhat limited contact with the maids at the school who spoke Ukrainian, and the colorful local traditions, all have undoubtedly contributed even more to her early childhood impressions of Ukrainian life.[3] During the summers of her stay in Kharkov, Mariia visited her

---

Gosud. uchebno-pedagogicheskoe izd-vo Ministerstva prosveshcheniia RSFSR, 1958), Vol. I, pp. 258-59.

[3]During her early childhood years in the village of Ekaterininskoe, Marko Vovchok was permitted to fraternize with the domestic help and the peasant children, and even to visit the peasant huts. See E. Brandis' Marko Vovchok (Moskva: Molodaia gvardiia, 1968), p. 9. For biographical details consult also: B. B. Lobach-Zhuchenko's Litopys zhyttia i tvorchosti Marka Vovchka (Kyiv: Dnipro, 1969); and Marko Vovchok's Tvory Marka Vovchka: Zhyttiepys i zhyttiepysni materiialy (Kyiv-Leipzig: Ukrains'ka nakladnia, 1913), Vol. I. Henceforth cited as B. B. Lobach-Zhuchenko, Litopys and Marko Vovchok, Zhyttiepys.

aunt, V. D. Pisareva, mother of the critic D. Pisarev. When she was fourteen, Mariia went to Orel, to live with her other aunt K. P. Mardovina, where she met an exiled young member of the Brotherhood of Sts. Cyril and Methodius, Opanas Markovych, who later became her husband.

From the available material of Marko Vovchok's family and her contemporaries (N. Leskov) we know that the Mardovins' residence served as a meeting place for the beau monde of Orel. Composed mostly of wealthy, liberal landowners, but not excluding young exiles and eccentric individuals such as Pavel Ivanovich Iakushkin, this society spent their pleasant evenings amid long idle discussions about patriotism and even dared to criticize the existing practice serfdom. More often than not, these evenings were supplemented by a musical performance and usually terminated with a singing session of folk songs, led by Opanas Markovych. This young Ukrainian ethnographer, born in the Poltava region in 1822, was the son of a rich but impractical landowner. Destitute, he managed to finish his university education and through common aspiration and outlooks had allied himself with other patriots: M. I. Kostomarov, P. O. Kulish, and V. M. Bilozerskii. In 1845, he became an active member of the Brotherhood of Sts. Cyril and Methodius, a Ukrainian secret political organization concerned with the abolition of serfdom and the establishment of the equality of all citizens of Slavic nations.[4] In 1847, the Brotherhood was dissolved by

---

[4] V. Kubijovyč, ed., Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia (Toronto: University of Toronto, Press, 1963), Vol. I, p. 675. Also: A. Pypin and V. Spasovich's Istoriia slavianskikh literatur (S. Pg.: Izdanie tipografii M. M. Stasiulevicha, 1879), Vol. I, pp. 376-79.

the government; the members were arrested and exiled and their works (together with words like "Ukraina" and "Zaporoz'ka sich") were prohibited.[5] Markovych's sentence was relatively mild. He was sent to Orel where he became an assistant in Governor Trubetzkoi's office. There he married Mariia Vilins'ka in 1851. After their marriage, the newlyweds, without any visible means of support, spent some ten and a half months visiting relatives and friends in Chernigov, Poltava, and Kiev provinces. After several futile attempts to secure a position, Opanas Markovych finally obtained the job of a corrector in Chernigovskie gubernskie vedomosti (The Chernigov Provincial Gazette) at a meager salary of fifteen rubles a month. It was in the village of Sorokoshychi that Mariia again became intensely exposed to peasant life and customs. Particularly in this poor and forsaken area between the Dnipro and Desna rivers, the Polish-Ukrainian wars of 1648-1654 were kept alive in numerous legends and songs. The young couple enthusiastically plunged into collecting folk songs, proverbs, sayings, and expressions. Opanas' significant work Slova i vyrazheniia Osterskogo uezda (Words and Expressions of the Osterskii District) was cited by Borys Hrinchenko "as a most complete work in the realm of collections of the national language".[6] Thus, it may be surmised that the frequent changes of dwelling, necessitated by Opanas' precarious means of support, were instrumental in familiarizing Marko Vovchok with the life, hopes, and different customs of the peasants. It is not without reason that

---

[5] E. Brandis, Marko Vovchok, p. 29.

[6] Ibid., p. 40. Throughout the thesis the translations are my own.

Panteleimon Kulish, the publisher of the first volume of Marko Vovchok's Narodni opovidannia (Folk Tales) stated that their author "worked as an ethnographer, but in ethnography proved to be a poet".[7] The ten months spent in the outskirts of Kiev provided Marko Vovchok with valuable material for Narodni opovidannia. She continued collecting songs and proverbs from acquaintances and peasants whose weddings and christenings she attended. Her several remaining notebooks from 1855-1857 contain the beginnings of a Ukrainian dictionary, as well as certain descriptions of the weather, the particulars of local flora and fauna, and the different crafts and customs. These annotations give us a good insight into her early literary work, for they contain first drafts of the stories in the Ukrainian language which are similar in composition and style to Narodni opovidannia.[8]

Marko Vovchok's ethnographic contributions may be located in A. L. Metlyns'kyi's Narodnye iuzhnorusskie pesni (South-Russian Folk Songs, 1854), M. T. Simonov's Ukrains'ki prykazky, pryslivia i take inshe (Ukrainian Sayings, Proverbs, and So Forth, 1864), M. I. Kostomarov's Istoricheskoe znachenie iuzhnorusskogo narodnogo pesennogo tvorchestva (The Historical Meaning of the South-Russian Folk Song Art, 1872), as well as in the works of P. Kulish, B. Antonovych, M. Drahomanov, and P. V. Kireevskii.[9] However, some of the publications did not contain

---

[7] Panteleimon Kulish, "Vzgliad na malorossiiskuiu slovestnost' po povodu vykhoda v svet knigi Narodni opovidannia Marka Vovchka," Vybrani tvory (Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oi literatury "Dnipro", 1969), p. 506.

[8] E. Brandis, Marko Vovchok, p. 51.

[9] B. B. Lobach-Zhuchenko, Litopys, p. 15. On p. 316, B. Lobach-

all of Marko Vovchok's entries. Thus, the manuscript sent by O. Markovych to M. Nomis (pseudonym of M. Simonov) for his collection contained some 30,000 entries, whereas the complete published collection contained not more than 15,000 examples. The merit of this manuscript was stressed by the Ukrainian poet Ivan Franko who asked V. M. Domanyts'kyi, Marko Vovchok's biographer, to search in the censorial archives for this valuable manuscript,[10] since it was an important contribution to Ukrainian ethnography. Thus, it can be seen that Marko Vovchok had obtained a profound knowledge of folklore before the first publication of Narodni opovidannia. Her marriage to an enthusiastic ethnographer and her numerous travels in the Ukraine only enhanced her already present natural interest and love for the common people. During most of her lifetime she continued to work among them, and then recorded the collected material for the purpose of utilizing it in her writing. From the biographic studies we are informed that Marko Vovchok as a young mother started to write stories and tales for her young son Bohdan. These first attempts undoubtedly served a few years later as the basis for her stories.

Marko Vovchok's Narodni opovidannia appeared in 1857, under the editorship of P. Kulish, a renowned Ukrainian writer, ethnographer and author of the ethnographic collection Zapiski o iuzhnoi Rusi (Notes of Southern Rus'). Written at the time when "the question was first raised about freeing the peasants from serfdom and giving the common,

---

Zhuchenko suggests O. M. Pypin's Istoriia russkoi folkloristiki, 1890, Vol. II, for a study of Marko Vovchok's role in the history of Ukrainian ethnography.

[10] B. B. Lobach-Zhuchenko, Litopys, p. 146.

ignorant people the right to an independent, human existence",[11] these eleven short folk tales established Marko Vovchok as a talented writer and assured her popularity and prestige in Ukrainian and Russian literary circles. In fact, Narodni opovidannia, her most famous and genuine work, serves to the present day, as the best example of her talent and is considered one of the masterpieces of Ukrainian literature. Encouraged, Marko Vovchok began to translate these tales herself and published them in Russkii vestnik (The Russian Herald) throughout 1858. At this time she also began to write in Russian and in 1859, her Rasskazy iz narodnogo russkogo byta (Tales of the Russian Common People) appeared.

Her Narodni opovidannia produced a lasting and profound impression on Taras Shevchenko, the eminent Ukrainian Romantic poet. Having read her stories in 1858, Shevchenko asked N. Lazarevskii for Marko Vovchok's address so that he could personally thank her for her "sincere and hearty 'Opovidannia'".[12] In February 1859, he commemorated their first meeting by dedicating a poem to Marko Vovchok ("Nedavno ia poza Uralom", which translated reads: Beyond the Urals not too long ago . . .).[13] In Petersburg, M. Vovchok met I. Turgenev who had this to recall about her popularity in the capital:

---

[11] N. I. Petrov, Ocherki istorii ukrainskoi literatury XIX stoletiia (Kyiv: Tip-a I. i A. Davidenko, 1884), p. 376.

[12] Quoted by V. Boiko, Marko Vovchok (Kyiv-Leipzig: Ukrains'ka nakladnia, 1918), p. 15.

[13] Taras Shevchenko, Kobzar (Winnipeg: I. Tyktor, 1960), p. 384. The first poem dedicated to M. Vovchok was Son (The Dream), written in 1858. Ibid., p. 381.

> . . . not too long ago . . . she moved to our northern capital and was the adornment and the main center of a small group of Little Russians [Ukrainians] who were living at that time in Petersburg and were enthusiastic over her works: they greeted them--the same way as they had greeted those of T. Shevchenko --as the literary Renaissance of their land.[14]

During one of his meetings with Shevchenko in 1859, Turgenev asked whom he should read in order to learn Ukrainian, and Shevchenko answered quickly that only Marko Vovchok has mastered the language.[15] That same year Turgenev translated her Narodni opovidannia into Russian, and her name instantaneously became famous in Russian literary circles. The appearance of a fresh young talent with profound sympathy for the peasants in the pre-reform period produced an overwhelming response from the critics. Within three years there were about thirty articles and reviews, about half of which date to 1859.[16] Critics such as N. Dobroliubov, D. Pisarev, N. Chernyshevsky, A. Druzhinin, M. de-Pule, N. Shelgunov, K. Leont'ev, A. Kotliarevskii, A. Skabichevskii and P. Tkachev, as well as the writers T. Shevchenko, M. Kostomarov, A. Hertzen, and F. Dostoevsky responded to her literary work with their articles. The violent polemics which sometimes ensued as a result of Marko Vovchok's writings only attest to the fact that criticism did not remain indifferent to her. But, in many cases critical articles were not so

---

[14] I. Turgenev, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem v dvadtsati vos'mi tomakh: Sochineniia (Moskva: Nauka, 1967), Vol. XIV, p. 227. Henceforth cited as I. Turgenev, Sochineniia.

[15] I. Turgenev, Sochineniia, Vol. XIV, pp. 229-30.

[16] D. Tamarchenko, Marko Vovchok: Krytyko-biohrafichnyi narys (Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oi literatury, 1946), p. 6.

much the result of a new publication by Marko Vovchok as they were inspired by a one-sided or unjust review on the part of a rival magazine. The questions debated in these magazines were often not concerned with the qualities of Marko Vovchok's stories and novels (especially in the aesthetic analysis of her realistic portrayal of life), but rather, the particular critics utilized her works in order to express their own opinions and beliefs. It was against such personal conceptions that some critics directed their reviews. Thus, Hertzen, in Kolokol (The Bell, 1859), and K. Leont'ev, in Otechestvennye zapiski (Notes of the Fatherland, 1859), denounced the critical and slanderous review of Biblioteka dlia chteniia (Library for Reading, 1859). F. Dostoevsky, similarly, published an article in Vremia (Time, 1861) in which he expressed his adverse opinion of Dobroliubov and Dobroliubov's school of criticism.

During 1859-1867, M. Vovchok, because of poor health, lived abroad (primarily in France), where writing became her profession. Left with little financial support, she began to write feverishly for Russian and Ukrainian journals (Russkii vestnik, S. Peterburgskie vedomosti [St. Petersburg Gazette], Osnova [The Foundation], and others) and in 1865, she began her forty-year-old contribution to Magasin d'éducation et de récréation (Journal of Education and Recreation), published by J. Hetzel.[17] Following her return to St. Petersburg, Marko Vovchok continued to write and to translate from French and English into Russian. In 1871, she became editor of the short-lived monthly Perevody

---

[17] B. Lobach-Zhuchenko, Litopys, p. 153.

luchshikh inostrannykh pisatelei (Translations of the Best Foreign Authors). In the span of ten years (1868-1878), Marko Vovchok translated over thirty-five works of D. Greenwood, Jules Verne, G. Salle, Victor Hugo, J. Stahl (pseudonym of J. Hetzel), as well as J. S. Mill, C. R. Darwin, and others. Her more famous Russian works of this period (for she continued to publish almost exclusively in Russian) are Zhivaia dusha (A Living Soul), Teploe gnezdyshko (A Warm Nest), and V glushi (In a Remote Corner).

Following some unpleasant court proceedings involving Marko Vovchok's unacknowledged use of other translations in her magazine, she moved from St. Petersburg with her second husband M. Lobach-Zhuchenko and left the literary scene to live incognito for about twenty years, during which she frequently changed her residence. Disputes revolving around her authorship of Narodni opovidannia[18] only further silenced the author. But despite this stagnation in her literary career, Marko Vovchok's works began to appear in Galicia; many were translated into Czech, Slovak, Bulgarian, Croatian, Polish, and Latvian. Some were reprinted by the Committee on Education in cheap editions for the reading of the peasants. In 1896-1899, seven of the eight volumes of Marko Vovchok's complete works were published in Saratov, and in 1898, she renewed the publication of her stories. The last years of her career Marko Vovchok spent writing mostly in Ukrainian ("Haidamaky")[19] and devoted special attention to the completion of fairy tales, which

---

[18] B. Lobach-Zhuchenko, Litopys, pp. 313-14, 321-22.

[19] Haidamaky was the name given to Ukrainian peasant insurgents of the XVIII century.

T. Shevchenko encouraged her to write. At the turn of the century her stories appeared in separate collections, such as Vik (The Century) and Kievskaia starina (Kievan Antiquity); the honoraria received from these publishings Marko Vovchok instructed to be distributed among the needy students.

Marko Vovchok's early stories (which caused the most numerous critical reactions) described the incessant conflict between the oppressed peasant and his landlord. Particularly moving are the pictures of suffering peasant women. Written on the eve of emancipation, these stories had a great affect on her contemporaries. In those years, as P. Kropotkin stated, "All educated Russia read the novels of M. Vovchok with delight, and wept over the fate of her peasant heroines."[20] However, with the reform of 1861, the topic of serfdom lost its prevalent impetus, and Marko Vovchok turned toward those socio-economic problems which at that time interested the Russian populace. The historical changes which occurred in the early sixties broadened Marko Vovchok's scope of topics and her style of writing. In addition to creating a few tales for children ("Nevil'nychka" [The Slave Girl], "Karmeliuk", "Vedmid'" [The Bear], and others), she began to concentrate on the difficulties of the newly-freed serfs, the "going to the people" problem, and the realistic descriptions of different social classes and

---

[20] P. Kropotkin, Ideals and Realities in Russian Literature (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1970), p. 226. Kropotkin's use of the word "novels" is inappropriate here because the heroines of Marko Vovchok's novels were not peasants but ladies of the merchant and upper strata. At best, the correct word should be "novellas". See also N. Golovina-Iurgenson's memoirs in Katarga i ssylka, 1923, as quoted by B. Lobach-Zhuchenko, Litopys, p. 100.

family life. Nevertheless, despite Marko Vovchok's experimentation with a variety of topics and styles, some critics considered her subsequent stories and tales unsuccessful and lacking the artistic merit of Narodni opovidannia. A. Skabichevskii and N. Shelgunov, for example, pointed out (even though in a somewhat exaggerated tone) that Marko Vovchok's later works did not follow the developments of the time but merely echoed what had been previously said.

As stated before, the appearance on the literary scene in the 1850's of a writer like Marko Vovchok coincided with the pre-emancipation era when progressive elements of Russian intelligentsia demanded freedom for the serfs. Marko Vovchok herself was one of the first writers to speak out against the abuse of the landowner's authority not only in the Ukrainian language but also in Russian. Marko Vovchok's literary works hold universal importance, because of her knowledge of the peasants' language and customs as well as her emphasis on their deplorable life conditions. Her vocation as the avenger of the wronged elevates her stories to a level of world literature similar to the one held by Harriet Beecher Stowe.

CHAPTER II

RUSSIAN SCHOOLS OF CRITICISM IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Almost every literary study which deals with some aspect of Russian literature demands substantial understanding of Russian literary criticism connected with that period which explains prevalent tendencies and movements in literature. Such is the case with our study about Marko Vovchok. Even though Marko Vovchok is considered a Ukrainian writer, the predominant theme of her Ukrainian and Russian works (which is also common to her Russian contemporaries) had always attracted many Russian critics. Therefore, in order to facilitate the reader's understanding of diverse literary reviews which Marko Vovchok's stories and novels received during the second half of the nineteenth century, we must present a concise (if somewhat limited) study of the Russian literary schools which clearly reflected not only the predominant literary currents but also echoed the socio-political beliefs of the time. It was on this basis, that is, according to the amount of social content within the text, that many works of the nineteenth century were accepted or condemned by the critics.

By 1857, when Marko Vovchok published her first collection of short stories, most vociferous Russian critics[1] had abandoned questions of an aesthetic nature (about artistic language and style) and directed their attention to social problems. The two principal movements of the

---

[1]For a more extensive study of Russian criticism in the first decades of the nineteenth century see Akademiia Nauk SSSR, Istoriia russkoi kritiki (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk, 1958), Vol. I, pp. 133-227.

1840's, which were instrumental in directing literature onto this course, were Slavophilism and Westernism. While Slavophiles were chiefly interested in Russia's past, which for them represented a "redeeming mission for humanity",[2] Westernists, who were greatly influenced by the western philosophy and literature (primarily German and French), claimed that "Russia was essentially European and that she should learn from and imitate western Europe".[3] The most outspoken and influential member of the Westernists was V.G. Belinsky (1811-1848). What is of importance to us here is his role as critic and his effect on the literary circles of his time. An essentially self-educated man who supplemented his three years of university education with persistent scholarly pursuits, Belinsky maintained an aesthetic outlook toward literature at the beginning of his career. In the early 1840's, however, Belinsky was converted to social radicalism, which influenced him to say that literature was to be modern, inspired by socially significant ideas and true to life. Whereas previously Belinsky strove to attain a kind of personally absolute spiritual life and rejected any primary concern with everyday triteness, he now became sensitive to society's ills and problems and turned all his energy to the world around him. In his newly-found credo he stressed the importance and the necessity with which an artist must wage battle against Russia's spiritual stagnation and propagate the need for social reform. Enthusiastic about literature and literary criticism, Belinsky was

---

[2] R. Hare, Russian Literature from Pushkin to the Present Day (London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1947), p. 6.

[3] R. Hingley, Russian Writers and Society 1825-1904 (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1967), p. 235.

extremely committed to his work. His ideological views, however, can hardly be termed consistent, since in his philosophical treatises, letters, and articles, Belinsky often vacillated and discarded his previous arguments.

Nevertheless, his reputation as literary lawmaker cannot be doubted. His followers considered him their venerable teacher and an indispensable guide. In his later writings he managed to obscure certain distinctions between art and life and their individual modes of expression and this made it possible for his successors to make varied interpretations of his theories. Preoccupied with the message in literature, he neglected the mechanics of the presentation; matters of style and form were hardly ever mentioned in his critiques. Under his influence many writers denounced the purely aesthetic view of art because in their opinion it propagated a purposeless existence of literature and devoted themselves exclusively to the portrayal of current events. Literary criticism, on the other hand, became the means for discussing social and philosophical questions. K. Waliszewski in his book on Russian literature justly pointed out that through the vast amount of material, Belinsky provided his followers with the ideas for

> . . . every ulterior line of literary criticism and artistic philosophy--the idealist and metaphysical Hegelian school, of which the most striking were Droujinine, N. Soloviov, and Edelsohn; the theory of organic criticism, wherein some of the Slavophils, I. Kirievski, C. Aksakov and especially A. Grigoriev, endeavoured to reconcile art and the national element; and the doctrine of the critical publicists, which Dostoievski was to raise to the level of his own talent, and which Pissarev, following after Tchernishevski, was to cast into the lowest depths of ribald controversy . . . .[4]

---

[4]K. Waliszewski, A History of Russian Literature (Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1969), p. 203.

Yet, Belinsky's influence is nowhere stronger than in the triumvirate of his followers: N.G. Chernyshevsky (1828-1889), N.A. Dobrollubov (1836-1861), and D.I. Pisarev (1840-1868), who had proclaimed affinity with their predecessor but had modified his views about literature to the extent where they denied any artistic value in a literary work which, according to their conceptions, did not portray reality faithfully.

Nikolai Chernyshevsky, the oldest of the three, established the view that art was only a mere imitation of life, and the fidelity with which art reproduced reality was the measure of artistic perfection. His dissertation Esteticheskie otnosheniia iskusstva k deistvitel'nosti (The Aesthetic Relations of Art to Reality, 1855) as well as his critical opus Ocherki gogolevskogo perioda russkoi literatury (Essays on the Gogol Period) became classics in literary criticism and later the basis of the utilitarian sociological criticism in literature. Nikolai Dobroliubov continued Chernyshevsky's view and stated his credo that a literary work must first of all strive to depict the needs and tribulations of the people. His primary objective was to help create a new democratic intelligentsia inspired by reason, justice, and humanity, who would be willing to serve the masses. But the socio-utilitarian ideal of the young generation and the admiration for the practicality of work was best expressed in the writings of Dimitrii Pisarev. Oblivious to any recognized authority, he and his followers advised the writers not to forsake social questions for aesthetic interests because such an attenuation of interest only limited art and made it meaningless. Thus, literary works became subordinate to everyday reality and in order for their publications to be considered literature writers were advised to become receptive to the need for social changes. In his articles dealing with Pushkin's verse,

Pisarev expressed little approval of this Romantic poet. In fact, Pisarev saw Pushkin's exclusive value in his role as a "stylist who perfected Russian verse".[5]

However, not all critics abandoned aesthetic questions for the propagation of pragmatism in literature. At the time when literature tried to continue the trend begun by Belinsky and embarked on a definite path toward realism, there remained few men, such as A.V. Druzhinin (1824-1864), P.V. Annenkov (1812-1887), and V.P. Botkin (1811-1869), whose primary concern was artistic development and evaluation of literature and not an ideological trail of criticism. While these critics stressed the meaning of the purely aesthetic side of art, at the same time they did not dismiss the role that art could play in the spiritual development of a nation. There seemed to be no one uniform direction of opinion among these so-called aesthetic critics, yet one principal line of thought prevailed in their treatises. They favored the depiction of reality not as it should be, but as it is, and did not believe that art should mainly serve the interests of the day[6] since the extremities of tendentiousness, as proposed by Chernyshevsky and Dobroliubov, could lead to the destruction of art. It is for this reason that critics such as Druzhinin voiced their disapproval of Marko Vovchok's realistic works. Since her Russian writings often lacked acceptable artistic standards, critics who favored literariness in literature could not accept favorable views of Marko Vovchok as expressed by Dobroliubov. These aesthetes believed that art

---

[5] D.I. Pisarev, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v shesti tomakh (S. Pg.: Obshchestvennaia pol'za, 1894), Vol. V, p. 79.

[6] Akademiia Nauk SSSR, Istoriia russkoi kritiki, Vol. I, p. 455.

could never be totally didactic since it could only be ruled by its own laws and principles and it could serve only the ever-present ideas of beauty, goodness, and truth.

The above-mentioned different viewpoints in Russian literary criticism in the 1850's and 1860's are closely connected with the evolution of the outlook of the Russian intelligentsia, the political situation of Russia at that time, and the relationship between writers, journals, and the Tsarist censorship. In order to facilitate the reader's understanding of this relationship, we find it necessary to say a few words in this respect.

It should be remembered that with the dissipation of democratic ideas in the 1840's in the European countries, the Russian intelligentsia became more conscious about the social conditions in its own land and expressed a great interest in social justice, which was characterized by the word "emancipation":

> The peasant was becoming emancipated from the landlord, the woman from family bondage, the citizen from the government, thought from legends and idols of the past. There was enthusiasm, there was passion, there was inspiration.[7]

The cry for emancipation became synonymous not only with the abolition of serfdom but also with the interest in the "woman question". Greatly influenced by German Romanticism and Idealism of the 1830's, the French feminist ideas of Saint-Simonians, Père Enfantin, and George Sand,[8] the

---

[7]Quoted by E. Solov'ev, Ocherki po istorii russkoi literatury XIX veka (S. Pg.: Tip. A. Kolpinskogo, 1902), p. 206. See also R. Hingley's Nihilists (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1967).

[8]Richard Stites, The question of the emancipation of women in nineteenth century Russia (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard

concern for the status of women had not become apparent until the renowned Russian surgeon N.I. Pirogov (1810-1881) and the publicist M.L. Mikhailov (1829-1865) had published their articles in which they stressed the need for the reformation of women's education.

The propagation of such reforms demanded a new channel, more liberated from the enclosed walls of the salons and the societies, one which would be more readily available to the public in a popular and universal language. The goal was achieved through the increased number of different publications, which, although frequently interdicted, totalled about 250 in various sizes, costs, and tendencies.[9] The magazines which dominated the literary scene at the end of the first half of the nineteenth century were Otechestvennye zapiski and Sovremennik (The Contemporary). In addition to printing the bulk of Russian literature, these monthlies contained translations of foreign literature, philosophy, and historical material. It is quite evident what importance was bestowed upon periodicals by this situation, not only in the literary world, but also in Russian intellectual life where many a political conflict or a professional confrontation among writers and journalists was perpetuated.

Thus, the 1850's and 1860's brought with them the new expansion of socio-political awareness and with it, the increase of journalism and the press. As time progressed, literary monthlies, or tolstye zhurnaly (thick journals) as they became known, were replaced by a daily newspaper

---

University, Cambridge, Mass.: 1968), p. 22. Also for an excellent interpretation of the influence of German Romantic literature on the development of radical movements see Hugh McLean's, ed., Russian Thought and Politics (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 169-200.

[9] E. Solov'ev, Ocherki po istorii russkoi literatury XIX veka, p. 216.

or weekly press which sought to ascertain its views, and in the process all existing publications fought with their adversaries. For example, Shchedrin with Sovremennik opposed the radicals of Russkoe slovo (Russian Word); Vremia of M.M. and F.M. Dostoevsky detested Sovremennik, and vice versa, and who knows where all this belligerence would have terminated if Sovremennik and Russkoe slovo had not been closed down.[10]

The extreme measure of the government in issuing penalties often affected various publications, both left-wing and conservative. Nevertheless, comparatively speaking and with present day facts in mind, the restrictions placed by the government on literature and journalism in the first half of the nineteenth century cannot be regarded as extremely severe. Many of the literary works were circulated in manuscript form without any intervention from the Third Department or were clandestinely imported into Russia from abroad.

But the European revolutions of 1848 necessitated more drastic measures with respect to Russia's internal affairs. Necessary steps were taken to prevent the further damaging effect of the "hydra of revolution" on Russia,[11] and the first strict measures were applied to the censorship of various jurisdictions. Investigating committees were formed to report all deviations from the rules to the Emperor himself. The editors of Sovremennik and Otechestvennye zapiski were reproved and literature was placed under the surveillance of Count D.P. Buturlin (1790-1849).

---

[10] A. Bagrii, Russkaia literatura XIXgo--pervoi chetverti XX-go vv. (Baku: Izd-vo Vostochnogo fakul'teta A.G.U., 1926), p. 122.

[11] Isaiah Berlin, "Russia and 1848," The Slavonic and East European Review, XXVI (1947-48), p. 351.

> Varying in severity, but nearly always a nuisance, it hampered writers, editors and publishers, their plans being continually wrecked by officials who were themselves often to be seen tripping over their own red tape.[12]

According to A.V. Nikitenko, himself a censor, at one time the number of officials in censorship exceeded the total number of volumes published in a year.[13] The fact was that almost any government department could interfere with any magazine. Censorship often resulted in omissions of complete sections and chapters of an author's work, not to mention individual words and phrases. Therefore, it is not without reason that the fifties (1848-1855) were considered the "blank space in Russian literature".[14] Despite the existence of talented authors these eight years produced very little of anything original because literature was under the censorship of Buturlin's committee. It was not until after the Crimean War and the preparation for reforms that the Tsarist regime made some concessions and assumed a less severe tone. Journals and newspapers were permitted to print articles about topics of national importance which before were published only with the government's approval.

The destructive force of the Tsarist censorship was even more vivid in its suppression of any organized Ukrainian activity and of the Ukrainian language in the press. In 1847, the society of Sts. Cyril and Methodius was dissolved and its members were arrested and severely punished. Some of them (including Shevchenko) were permitted to return

---

[12] Ronald Hingley, Russian Writers and Society 1825-1904, p. 225.

[13] Ibid., p. 228.

[14] E. Solov'ev, Ocherki po istorii russkoi literatury XIX veka, p. 197.

and resume their literary work only in the late 1850's and early 1860's, but their former thoughts and convictions had lost their élan. As a result of severe measures taken by the government in the period of 1847-1856, there were only nineteen Ukrainian works published, as compared with thirty-one in the 1830's. Despite the enthusiastic support for Ukrainian language publications on the part of various Russian journals, newspapers, and concerned individuals in the late 1850's and early 1860's, the Imperial government took severe measures to curb any "printed material" in Ukrainian, because, as Minister of Internal Affairs Petr A. Valuev had stated in 1863, it was "harmful to Russian interests".[15] The insurrection in Poland and Lithuania against Russian rule and its attempts to arouse Ukrainian peasants in a similar manner were responsible for influencing Alexander II to launch his additional anti-Ukrainian precautions.

The first of such blows to the Ukrainian public was the suspension of the publication of Osnova in 1862 and the closing of all Ukrainian-organized Sunday schools. In 1863, the government issued instructions not to permit publication of Ukrainian books with religious content or those intended for general education, and in 1876, it supplemented its previous stand with an ukaz (decree) which established the precedence of Russian orthography over Ukrainian.[16] Because of these measures many educational activities were severely curtailed, though a certain number

---

[15] Г. Savchenko, The Suppression of Ukrainian Activities in 1876 (Munchen: W.Г. Verlag, 1970), p. xvi. See also A. Pypin and V. Spasovich's Istoriia slavianskikh literatur, pp. 383-86.

[16] Ibid., p. xxvi. See also P. Okhrimenko's Istoriia ukrainskoi literatury (Moskva: Izd-vo Prosveshchenie, 1970), p. 181.

of Ukrainians continued to work within the boundaries of the law. For example, the Kiev Branch of the Imperial Russian Geographic Society channelled its work to collecting ethnographic and statistical information on Ukrainian-inhabited provinces and sought to establish contact with Ukrainians in Galicia. Thus, as a result of these suppressions the Ukrainian cultural movement shifted to the west, that is, to Galicia.

As a result of the restrictive policies described above various new literary currents and movements (such as Naturalism and later Impressionism) were either misunderstood or were ignored by the Russian critics. On one hand, the Tsarist censorship was the culprit. On the other, the critics who adhered to the established utilitarian views about literature, which predominated in the second half of the nineteenth century, remained steadfast in their own convictions and admonished writers for speaking otherwise. In the case of Marko Vovchok, the following observations should be made. While both literatures, Russian and Ukrainian, were permeated with social problems and the eradication of all existing evils and were in turn checked by the ubiquitous censorship, one must not forget that the development of Ukrainian literature was restricted even more when the Tsarist administration subsequently prohibited the publication of all Ukrainian books, including belles-lettres. Writers such as Marko Vovchok, whose works were severely censored or were not printed in the Russian Ukraine, began to publish in the journals founded in the West Ukraine. This factor, of course, affected greatly any proper critical evaluation of her Russian and Ukrainian works. Furthermore, despite the later influences of neo-romanticism on her writing and the authoritative voice of the romantic writer and Marko Vovchok's critic, Kulish, she remained a realist writer. She did not achieve either

Turgenev's prominence or that of other Realist writers, but she did successfully work at the time when the dominant force in literature was Realism and when great demands were placed on writers to propagate the need for social changes. Representatives of this movement, such as Chernyshevsky and Turgenev, were her friends and supporters and it is precisely for this realist trend in her work that she was unjustly attacked by some later critics. In addition to these observations, one very important element should be noted in Marko Vovchok's literary career. Since she wrote simultaneously in Russian and Ukrainian, Marko Vovchok made contributions to both literatures. While her Russian stories and novels have given her a wider reading public, and, as such, were often the subject of Russian literary reviews, her Ukrainian works (excluding Narodni opovidannia) have been virtually ignored by the Russian critics. Conversely, the same is true with respect to her role in Ukrainian literature. Only one collection of Marko Vovchok's short stories, namely, Narodni opovidannia, was sufficient to demonstrate her great contribution to Ukrainian literature, and it is precisely this volume of tales which was venerated by many Ukrainian critics while hardly a mention was given to her Russian stories and novels. Nevertheless, despite these limitations, most of Marko Vovchok's writings in the Russian language, as well as her first Ukrainian work, Narodni opovidannia, were not ignored by many Russian critics, though they greeted each of her individual works with mixed opinions.

CHAPTER III

RUSSIAN CRITICISM OF MARKO VOVCHOK'S WORKS

In the previous chapter we have seen how various influences, both foreign and domestic, affected the social consciousness of Russian intelligentsia. As a result of this new awareness, one of the most important events of the 1850's was a literary movement known as izuchenie russkoi narodnosti (study of Russian national character), that is, the striving to penetrate into the life of the common people. The subject of the Russian peasant, which predominated in literature for the remainder of the century, was already present in the writings of Aksakov and Gogol, but these writers almost exclusively worshipped and admired moral qualities and virtues of the peasant. On the eve of emancipation this idealistic image of the common man was altered by numerous descriptions of his deplorable conditions--his poverty and suffering. What was before only a superficial interest in the peasant now in the late 1850's and early 1860's became the focal point of a demand for his emancipation. Professor A. Bagrii summarized this period in Russian history in the following manner:

> The period of the 1860's--above all, was a critical time. Reappraisal of values had captured the entire strata of society, and, in accordance with this, the highest success was achieved by those works of art which touched upon the general social themes. The primary motif was the judgment of that structure of the Russian life which was based on serfdom.[1]

---

[1] A.V. Bagrii. Russkaia literatura XIX-go--pervoi chetverti XX-go vv., p. 110.

Thus, it is not unusual that most of the literature of the late 1850's seemed devoted to this poignant problem. Narodni opovidannia of Marko Vovchok was no exception. Even though Marko Vovchok's literary career is not limited to only this one literary work, it is, nevertheless, this first and foremost contribution of the author that has incurred numerous critiques. Differing in their objective, these critical reviews offer us interesting insight into the structure of Russian critical movements from the 1850's to the 1870's.

Hitherto, very little investigation has been done[2] of this diverse critical material dissipated throughout many nineteenth century magazines, even though single quotations of various critics have been included in Soviet and Western treatises dealing with Marko Vovchok. Moreover, the best available compilation of critical articles by M. Bernshtein, Marko Vovchok v krytytsi: Zbirnyk statei, retsenzii, vyslovliuvan' (Marko Vovchok in Criticism: A Collection of Articles, Reviews, and Opinions) is limited to those reviews which echoed the so-called "revolutionary" tendency in Russian criticism. Other convictions which differed sharply from those prevalent opinions are rarely mentioned and often overlooked. It is our attempt to present in this chapter an investigation of important and diverse critiques of Marko Vovchok's literary works written during the first twenty years of her career as writer, for it was during the period from 1857 to 1878 that the greatest number of critiques on her works appeared in Russian journals

---

[2] M. Taranenko, Marko Vovchok v svitli rosiis'koi revoliutsiino-demokratychnoi krytyky (Master's dissertation, Kyiv, 1952). See Akademiia Nauk URSR, Marko Vovchok: Statti i doslidzennia (Kyiv: AN URSR, 1957), p. 156. Henceforth cited as Akademiia Nauk URSR, Statti. See also V. Boiko's Marko Vovchok for a concise summary of some critical responses.

and magazines. The ideas expressed within these analyses illuminate the prolific and manifold period in Russian literary criticism during the first decades of the second half of the nineteenth century.

In recent years, some investigators of Marko Vovchok's literary productivity have attempted to classify various critical reviews of her work, but they tended to be either too general or too partial.[3] Fortunately, M. Bernshtein in his book Ukrains'ka literaturna krytyka 50-70kh rokiv XIXst. (Ukrainian Literary Criticism from 1850 to the 1870's) made a more dispassionate assertion:

> The violent polemics which revolved around Narodni opovidannia and Rasskazy iz narodnogo russkogo byta developed mostly in three directions: concerning the unmasking [of serfdom] in the author's work; the very nature of the description of life and the psychological make-up of the people; and finally, concerning their artistic and aesthetic merits.[4]

We agree with Bernshtein's division, however, with some modifications. Bernshtein's first two points, that is, the exposition of serfdom and the description of life and people, can be treated as one problem. Also, the study of language and stylistic features of Marko Vovchok's works should be included in this division. Considering that such formalist efforts of studying literary productions appeared at the time when civic criticism predominated, we are not surprised that it

---

[3] One such critic is O. Zasenko. See Akademiia Nauk URSR, Statti, pp. 24-25.

[4] M. Bernshtein, Ukrains'ka literaturna krytyka 50-70kh rokiv XIXst. (Kyiv: AN URSR, 1959), p. 59.

was not profound and that it remained virtually unsupported by analogous studies. Thus, the three types of the critical reviews of Marko Vovchok's works are as follows: the social, the aesthetic, and the stylistic. To the first group belong A. Kotliarevskii, N. Dobroliubov, P. Tkachev, A. Skabichevskii, and N. Shelgunov. These critics, who were under the influence of western philosophy and literature, believed that the most important element in a literary work was its desire, in fact, its goal, to depict current event, problems, and needs of the people. The aesthetic and the stylistic features were virtually ignored, while the social message within the story or novel gained primary importance.

The second group of critics, composed of A. Druzhinin and F. Dostoevsky, examined Marko Vovchok's works from the aesthetic point of view. In reviewing Marko Vovchok's work, they emphasized the beauty of the author's sketches of the good nature of the peasants but were critical of the realistic descriptions of the peasants' status. These aesthetes argued that art is governed by its own laws and cannot be reduced to serve one purpose, that is, to present to the public only deplorable situations of the people.

The third and final group in our examination is composed of young D. Pisarev, K. Leont'ev, and M. de-Pule. These critics evaluated the literary merits of the author's fiction. They expressed little concern for the realistic descriptions of the stories and only stressed the value of Marko Vovchok's style of writing: the literary devices and the unique manner of expression.

One of the very first reviews of Narodni opovidannia, which praised the author's undaunted exposure of the peasants' living conditions under serfdom, was A. Kotliarevskii's article "Narodni opovidannia Marka Vovchka", written under the pseudonym of Ek. S-t. in Otechestvennye zapiski, in 1859. Kotliarevskii was a Slavist and an archeologist by profession, and his few critical articles dealing with works of literature possess a popularly-critical approach based on social criticism. In Marko Vovchok's tales he saw the call to change the existing conditions of the peasants because according to him, "the short tales of Marko Vovchok clearly show what one should expect if the existing affair were to be left as it exists now."[5]

In his brief analysis, Kotliarevskii cited three of the eleven short stories, namely, "Kozachka" (A Cossack Woman), "Odarka", and "Horpyna" (all of which describe woman's suffering and misery under the institution of serfdom) a truthful portrayal of peasant life. Even though the critic admitted that discriminating feelings produced by these stories are indeed the reader's first impressions,[6] he expressed his preference for the realistic unpleasant descriptions which overshadow with their importance any aesthetic pleasure. In fact, his praise for the realistic trend in these tales was carried to the extreme when he

---

[5] A. Kotliarevskii, "Narodni opovidannia Marka Vovchka," Otechestvennye zapiski, CXXIII (1859), p. 5.

[6] Ibid., pp. 5-6.

admitted the importance of art, sciences, and literature only when they served life[7] and were subordinate to it.

Kotliarevskii's civic critique of Marko Vovchok's Narodni opovidannia was soon followed by N. Dobroliubov's examination of her Russian tales which was published in Sovremennik in 1860. This was the most voluminous and the most exhaustive (if void of literary evaluation) of all the critical articles. In this treatise, which can be regarded as the culminating expression of Russian utilitarian criticism of the 1850's and 1860's, Dobroliubov attempted to justify the peasants' innate desire for freedom and their strength of character, which despite many years of moral and physical turpitude, had been preserved intact. As one of the so-called radical democrats, who demanded abrupt changes in the Russian Empire (such as the abolition of serfdom), Dobroliubov wanted to demonstrate that peasants are an important and indispensable element of Russian society. In fact, he wishes to portray "the difference that distinguished the feelings and actions of the common man from . . . people who have been corrupted by their unnatural upbringing and position [i.e., the gentry]".[8] The stories "Masha", "Igrushechka", "Sasha", and others, chosen for Dobroliubov's review, offered the critic an opportunity to assert his sociological views about Russian society, namely, the peasants and the gentry.

---

[7] A. Kotliarevskii, "Narodni opovidannia Marka Vovchka," p. 5.

[8] N. Dobroliubov, "Features for the Characterization of the Russian Common People," in Selected Philosophical Essays (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1956), p. 515. Henceforth cited as N. Dobroliubov, Essays.

Needless to say, Dobroliubov's strongest views were directed against landlords: their affected refined manners, flowery speech, and shallow character, which Marko Vovchok aptly depicted in her stories. Particularly poignant is his opinion about inadequate methods of educating children, which Dobroliubov based on the story "Igrushechka" where Marko Vovchok described how the narrow and trivial interests of the teachers and a vacuous parental life provided little sustenance for the inquisitive child. The critic asserted his belief that education based on such a foundation and unrelated to everyday life could provide only abstract ideas and could not offer any answers to a child's numerous questions.

In the peasant heroes and heroines of these stories Dobroliubov admired their natural desire for freedom and their capability for displaying profound emotions. Even though Dobroliubov called Masha's desire for freedom from serfdom an "unconscious and reckless heroism", he did not find her behavior unnatural. Unlike many peasants of her time, Masha was able to preserve and then reveal, according to Dobroliubov, the inherent yearning for liberty. This, of course, should not be misconstrued to mean that Dobroliubov idealized the common man. While his enthusiastic evaluation of "Masha" can be viewed as an example of his exaltation for the heroine's defiance, the following words express Dobroliubov's somewhat reserved opinion of the Russian muzhik:

> Not all natures are soft and yielding like those of Sasha or Nadyozha, not all are as firm and sensible as Katerina, not all are stubbornly opposed to evil like Masha; we meet with other natures, stern and ruthless, whose inner reaction to every encroachment upon their personality develops to truly formidable dimensions and assumes an aggressive character.[9]

---

[9] N. Dobroliubov, Essays, p. 535.

To strengthen this point, the critic chose coachman Efim of "Kupecheskaia dochka" (A Merchant's Daughter). According to Dobroliubov, Efim represented a peasant's strong nature, which, unfortunately, remained uncultivated, and because of this, Efim was unable to elevate himself from maliciousness and vengeance.

It is apparent that the reason for Dobroliubov's detailed evaluation and examination of Marko Vovchok's stories was to show relationships between the common people and the educated classes and through these associations illustrate his own social theories. He ascertained that while wealthy landowners were incapable of concentrated and profound passions because they were easily discouraged by their boring occupations, the environment and the general traditional upbringing of the peasants had been at fault for developing various vices (such as arson, vengeance, and crimes of passion). In order for their moral qualities to be channelled to give constructive results, these peasants had to be recognized, Dobroliubov advocated, as something more than "a special breed which is capable only of apathy or of brutality".[10] Although Dobroliubov stated his belief that Marko Vovchok's stories lacked "artistic fulness",[11] he, nevertheless, praised their vividness, clearness, but above all, their truthfulness of description.[12] He claimed that the aesthetic merit of a literary work depended on the factual depiction of life of the Russian people, and if these pictures appeared distorted or exceptional, then the

---

[10] N. Dobroliubov, Essays, p. 542.

[11] Ibid., p. 474.

[12] B.B. Lobach-Zhuchenko, Litopys, p. 93.

stories were insignificant.

Following the reform, of 1861, Marko Vovchok broadened her topics and began to describe different strata of Russian society in the post-emancipation period. Such a variety of themes offered numerous possibilities of critical approaches, yet the civic point of view of her stories and novels persisted in the magazines and journals. The critics Tkachev, Shelgunov, and others, who belonged to the more conscious part of the Russian intelligentsia in the late sixties, continued to search for and praise the social meaning of literature. Despite reactionary measures taken by the government to curb discontent in the Empire, these critics vociferously demanded from Marko Vovchok honest descriptions of the Russian people and condemned bucolic tendencies in her earlier work.

One such critic, who was intent on studying and analyzing social problems but who ignored questions of artistic nature within literary texts, was P.N. Tkachev.[13] In a few of his essays where he meant to analyze works of literature, Tkachev's attention was given not to the novels, but rather to the socio-political questions described within them. Thus, his article "Podrastaiushchie sily" (Growing Strength) reviewed various descriptions of the new heroine in the three novels of V. Sleptsov, M. Avdeev, and Marko Vovchok.

The critic discovered that the picture of the new heroine in Marko Vovchok's novel Zhivaia dusha was weak and incomplete. He accused the author of transmitting her personal "bourgeois tendencies and

---

[13] In the 1870's, P. Tkachev abandoned his narrow sociological criticism and raised questions related to the meaning of literature as art, the purposes of literary criticism, and the nature of artistic works. See B. Koz'min's Literatura i istoriia (Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1969), p. 472.

philistine outlook on life"[14] (that is, views of her own social class) to the heroine Masha. As a rational, utilitarian thinker, Tkachev failed to understand the Romantic elements[15] in Marko Vovchok's novel, particularly as they are expressed in the relationship between Masha, the protegée of a liberal and wealthy benefactress, and Zagainyi, the representative of the intelligentsia. In Tkachev's opinion, Masha's behavior, that is, her flight from home and her decision to remain with Zagainyi, were unworthy of the new type of Russian woman and unpardonable in the author.

> The girl who dreams of resting her weary head on someone's shoulder has nothing in common with the new woman. She is just another young lady . . . [who] panics because she is unsure of her beau. . . .
> . . . . . .
> Because she fell in love with Zagainyi, . . . Masha began to work with him. . . . If she had fallen for him because of his activity, this would have diminished this bourgeois color of the novel. . . .[16]

Perhaps too much emphasis on love and its miraculous effect on the dissatisfied and disappointed Masha[17] make the novel Zhivaia dusha a remnant of the romantic tradition rather than of Realism. It was the author's

---

[14] P.N. Tkachev, "Podrastaiushchie sily," in Izbrannye sochineniia (Moskva: Izd-vo Vsesoiuznogo obshchestva polit-katorzhan i ssylnoposelentsev, 1932), Vol. I, p. 298.

[15] The Romantic elements in Marko Vovchok's works became also the object of Kulish's criticism. However, this representative of the Romantic school in Ukrainian literature was displeased with Marko Vovchok's realist writing because it lacked the author's personal opinions and beliefs. Thus, it is not altogether surprising when some years later Marko Vovchok expressed her convictions in a romantic tale "Karmeliuk", which she dedicated to Kulish.

[16] Ibid., pp. 303-6.

[17] Ibid., p. 308.

treatment of the subject, namely, that a woman's life should be based on love, which irritated Tkachev and convinced him to appraise negatively Marko Vovchok's description of the heroine in new social conditions. The most important question for him was the social sense of literature, and if it were not the product of man's sociological and psychological activity, it offered no reason for evaluation.[18]

One of the more severe criticisms during this period of Marko Vovchok's writing, which analyzed the validity of the portrayal of reality in her texts, was expressed by the liberal critic A. Skabichevskii, even though twenty years later he did not hesitate to objectively acclaim her talent.[19] In reviewing Marko Vovchok's later stories, some of which still revolved around peasant life ("Try doli" [Three Fates], "Pavlo Chornokryl", and "Karmeliuk"), Skabichevskii came to the erroneous conclusion that the author lacked knowledge of the life she described and had given her peasant heroes attributes of another class or had overdramatized some of the social factors in their lives. Moreover, Skabichevskii believed that those stories which depicted life of the gentry or the town-dwellers ("Instytutka" and "Tiuleva baba" [The Lacy Cake]) were much closer to Marko Vovchok and, as a result, were true to life.[20] This accusation is

---

[18] B. Koz'min, Literatura i istoriia, pp. 484-85.

[19] A. Skabichevskii, Sochinenii A. Skabichevskogo (S. Pg.: Tip-a Iu. N. Erlikh, 1903), Vol. II, p. 229

[20] A. Skabichevskii, "Protivopolozhnaia krainost'," Otechestvennye zapiski, CLXXIX (1868), p. 44. A similar view was expressed by an anonymous critic in the reactionary organ Zaria (Dawn). Moreover, the latter also stated that Marko Vovchok owed her popularity to her fortunate and timely appearance when topics dealing with serfdom and life in the post-reform period were very popular. See Anon., "Sochineniia Marka Vovchka, Zhivaia dusha," Zaria, No. 10 (1869), pp. 246-68.

unjustified, for Marko Vovchok was equally familiar with the life of the wealthy and of the peasants through numerous travels, personal observations and associations with people. In writing "Try doli", "Karmeliuk" and "Pavlo Chornokryl" Marko Vovchok transferred her knowledge of reality, particularly of the Ukrainian mode of life.

Skabichevskii also claimed that in presenting stories with universal themes, the author had failed to give her heroes distinctive color and did not present them in a form which would identify them with the simple people. For example, the principle motif in the story "Pavlo Chornokryl" was incompatibility in marriage, and its consequence--murder. Older, and of a more fiery nature than his young and jovial wife Halia, Pavlo resolved himself to a highly withdrawn and dejected life which he would not permit her to dispel. Between the two unevenly matched people came Varka, a maid on the estate, who shared Pavlo's complaints about life. In order to rid himself of Halia and marry Varka, Pavlo killed his wife but was unable to survive the spiritual suffering after the crime and gave himself up to the police. In this story Marko Vovchok asserted her opinion that peasants are also capable of profound and ardent passions, but Skabichevskii considered Pavlo's analysis of his transgression atypical of a peasant.[21] It is the critic's conviction that the author should have presented Pavlo without any ability to reason about his fate, as one who would have tacitly submitted to his lugubrious destiny and accepted his misfortune as God's punishment.[22] Thus, Skabichevskii was displeased

---

[21] A. Skabichevskii, "Protivopolozhnaia krainost'," p. 30.

[22] Ibid., p. 31.

with Marko Vovchok's peasant heroes who were granted capabilities of philosophizing about their life and who, as a result of this, arrived at conclusions which only educated men could express.

The critic approached Marko Vovchok's two fairy-tales, "Karmeliuk" and "Deviat' brativ i desiata sestrytsia Halia" (Nine Brothers and the Tenth Sister Halia), in a somewhat naturalist manner. In his opinion, social actions were nothing more than a direct reflection of social conditions; thus, through different general characteristics one could establish patterns of behavior.[23] This, however, he found lacking in Marko Vovchok's "Karmeliuk" because the descriptions of Karmeliuk's childhood and youth do not justify his transformation into an outlaw. In the second story, where the theme is similar to that of "Karmeliuk", the author presented a family's extreme poverty in such a way as to justify the brothers' escape to the forest as thieves. Accordingly, this presentation the critic found to be more commendable.

N. Shelgunov also voiced his dissatisfaction with Marko Vovchok's works, which was typical of the civic critics of the 1860's. In his articles, Shelgunov urged writers to depict and describe the necessity for social changes, but, despite Marko Vovchok's attempt to portray such need for further reforms, Shelgunov found her stories unsuccessful. He accused the author of being sentimental, insincere, unknowledgeable about life, but, above all, of expressing borrowed or passé ideas which did not help to develop Russian consciousness.[24] We

---

[23] A. Skabichevskii, "Protivopolozhnaia krainost'," p. 35.

[24] N. Shelgunov, "Glukhaia pora," Delo, No. 4 (1870), pp. 15-17.

might agree with some of Shelgunov's reproaches, namely, that a romantic, irrational concept of freedom (Marko Vovchok thought that it is better to have disadvantageous freedom than none at all) permeates the stories "Instytutka" (Institute Girl) and "Ledashchytsia" (Lazy Girl) and that some of her stories and novels were outdated with respect to the social message within them. However, we must refute his accusation that Marko Vovchok described life which was not typically[25] Russian or that her heroes and heroines lacked distinct characteristics. Shelgunov, like his contemporary, P. Tkachev, demanded that authors must maintain a distinct social outlook and since this was lacking in Marko Vovchok, he termed her stories emotionally overburdened and unrelated to contemporary problems:

> His [Marko Vovchok's] idea is void of any social insight, that is, he [the author] has no ability to see clearly . . . through barely visible dissipated facts and formulate that which is beginning to agitate society. . . .[26]

Consequently, Shelgunov believed that Marko Vovchok's literary works were not worthy of "special analyses and investigations",[27] on the basis of which one could establish the significance of a writer.

In reviewing Shelgunov's article, one more factor must be examined, which has been erroneously expressed by some of Marko Vovchok's

---

[25] N. Shelgunov, "Glukhaia pora," pp. 18, 21, 26.

[26] Ibid., p. 26. Furthermore, Shelgunov unjustly pointed out that serfdom and its abject consequences were expressed much better by Marko Vovchok's predecessors.

[27] Ibid., p. 24.

nineteenth-century critics[28] and which Shelgunov developed in more detail, namely, the reproach that Marko Vovchok always borrowed literary themes and devices from other authors. The aim of these critics, which was based on their presuppositions that works of literature should expound and artistically portray contemporary social conditions, was to indicate and evaluate Marko Vovchok's status as a Russian writer. While no uniform opinion prevailed among them, they all found a similarity between the novels and stories of Marko Vovchok and those of Turgenev, Shchedrin, and Gogol. Thus, Shelgunov's judgment appeared to echo this general view of the critics that Marko Vovchok was not original since she "always followed someone else, without discriminating about time or its needs".[29] In his opinion, the author's folk tales were only remnants of Turgenev's own sketches of peasant life, and her later stories "Tiuleva baba" and "Glukhoi gorodok" (Remote Little Town) were written in the manner of Gogol's social critiques. The critic expressed his belief that Marko Vovchok's experimentation with various topics was not part of her development as an author but a regression to the now defunct Gogol manner of writing.

Shelgunov's prime objection to Marko Vovchok's stories was that while she described correctly different classes of Russian life, she restricted herself to narrow themes about family life and presented her views with sentimental tendentiousness which had nothing in common with

---

[28]The critics Skabichevskii and Shelgunov as well as M. de-Pule and the anonymous critic in the magazine Zaria were all interested in the question whether Marko Vovchok imitated themes from other authors.

[29]N. Shelgunov, "Glukhaia pora," p. 14.

contemporary social problems. However, despite his accusation about the instability of Marko Vovchok's association with everyday issues, Shelgunov maintained that Marko Vovchok was

> that literary barometer on which one can examine all the phases in the development of social thinking of Russian educated society. When the serfdom question excited everyone, Vovchok described simple people striving for freedom. The woman question transferred by Vovchok into the village also found in him [Marko Vovchok] its spokesman. . . .[30]

Marko Vovchok's experimentation with various topics as well as her weak commitment to social issues that predominated in the post-reform Russia influenced Shelgunov, together with Skabichevskii, to consider the author's talent weak and her position as a Russian writer trivial and comparable to that of her predecessors of the 1840's who were idealistic and sentimental in their depiction of peasant life. Hence, according to Shelgunov, her stories and novels which reminded him of other similar themes and situations were neither original nor beneficial to society.

The mistaken judgment of Tkachev, Shelgunov, and Skabichevskii was based on the demands they placed on literature during this time. Since they were not interested in certain other valuable aspects of the author's work, such as the linguistic achievements (particularly in Ukrainian) and its artistic merit or were insufficiently prepared to discuss them, their evaluation of Marko Vovchok is one-sided. Despite the fact that these critics were not equipped for such a study, with the knowledge and training which their successors possessed (the Formalists, for example), certain writers and critics, such as A.V. Druzhinin and

---

[30]N. Shelgunov, "Glukhaia pora," p. 23.

F.M. Dostoevsky, whose objective was to discuss artistic and aesthetic merits of literature, promptly exposed limits of civic criticism and rebuked its propagators for becoming infatuated too quickly with Marko Vovchok and her stories and novels exclusively on the basis of their content.

Although A.V. Druzhinin, the prolific critic and propagator of the aesthetic approach to literature, in his essay[31] did not reprove Russian writers in general for depicting hopeless peasant life and serfdom,[32] he, nevertheless, disclosed his preference for topics not connected with this institution. He selected the story "Sestra" as Marko Vovchok's best work. The critic's choice was not accidental, because in "Sestra" the author described a sister's unwavering devotion for her brother, which was not related in any way to the serf system and which Druzhinin considered as one of the eternal attributes of mankind. In fact, he found the heroine charming--the epitomy of the best qualities of women:

> The heroine of the story stands out before us . . . in all her quiet devotion, in all her indestructable love toward native home and relatives, with a soul, created for self-sacrifice and with tireless hands for work. The brightness and charm . . . are greatly dissipated throughout the whole story . . . and make "Sestra" a true idyll, deserving highest praises.[33]

As might be anticipated, not all the stories were accepted with

---

[31]See A.V. Druzhinin's "Ukrainskie narodnye rasskazy Marka Vovchka," in Sobranie sochinenii (S. Pg.: Tip-a Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk, 1866), Vol. VII.

[32]Druzhinin advised that such stories should not portray exceptional occurrences under serfdom but its more general and typical influence on society.

[33]Ibid., p. 571.

such fervor by Druzhinin. He insisted that Marko Vovchok's subsequent stories "Kozachka" and "Odarka" (both of which depicted despicable behavior of the landlords towards their serfs) were too one-sided in their description of the vicious gentry and the meek peasants and reminded the reader that such "exaggeration" in a literary work should be restrained by artistic laws.[34] The critic advised that in order to expose harmful and obsolete institutions, such as serfdom, the author should not restrict himself to individual events but try to reveal some deeply-rooted basis for the deplorable condition of the peasants. A firm believer in the ever-present goodness of mankind, Druzhinin, somewhat idealistically, maintained the opinion that the peasant's suffering was not a direct result of his personal confrontation with the landlord but the consequence of an extravagant life of the gentry and the unnecessary demands made by it.[35] Thus, Druzhinin believed that attenuation of such luxurious existence, together with man's inherent quality of kindness, would quickly abolish cruel treatment of the peasants.

F.M. Dostoevsky also voiced his dissenting opinion about the artistic merits of Marko Vovchok's early Russian tales. Even though her Rasskazy were not the object of his analysis (1861), Dostoevsky took the opportunity to assert his belief that he doubted her talent.[36] We do

---

[34] A.V. Druzhinin, "Ukrainskie narodnye rasskazy Marka Vovchka," pp. 573-75.

[35] Ibid., p. 575.

[36] F.M. Dostoevsky, "G. (Dobroliu)bov i vopros ob iskusstve," in Dnevnik pisatelia za 1873 god (Paris: YMCA Press, no date given), pp. 82, 82. For a more detailed study of Dostoevsky's views see J. Van der Eng's Dostoevskij Romancier (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1957).

not wish to argue here the valid or weak points of Dostoevsky's opinion of Marko Vovchok, but it should be emphasized that Dostoevsky (after his youthful sympathy for Westernist ideas) became an outspoken opponent of Realism. Excluding any personal reasons for the antagonism between Dostoevsky and realist writers such as Turgenev, it should be observed that the main cause of the difference between the two writers was their contrasting world-views. While Turgenev adhered to rationalism and positivism, Dostoevsky was an idealist. He denied that through rationalism and reason one can grasp or create a new reality. Furthermore, Dostoevsky reproached realist writers for propagating laws and regulations for art and for reducing it to utility. He emphasized that the only usefulness of art is aesthetic, that is, art answers man's inherent need for beauty.

Dostoevsky's critique was one of many protests against the coercion of literature in the 1850's and 1860's by the social and political ideas and opinions when very frequently the opposition among critics became highly personal and sometimes resulted in extreme declarations, both verbal and printed.[37]

Dostoevsky found Dobroliubov's over-zealous belief that the story "Masha" could produce an overpowering effect on its readers a "comical assumption" and the work itself "improbable . . . deformed . . .

---

[37]One such example was the open enmity between Dobroliubov (of Sovremennik) and A. Pisemskii (of Biblioteka dlia chteniia). Pisemskii's evaluation of Marko Vovchok's writing was actually his defense against Dobroliubov's attacks upon his works. During one of its most acute moments, the editors of the satirical magazine Iskra, V. Kurochkin and M. Stepanov, challenged Pisemskii to a duel. See O. Mohylians'kyi's "Pysems'kyi pro Marka Vovchka," Radians'ke literaturoznavstvo, No. 2 (1960), pp. 117-20.

and incoherent".[38] He was convinced that Dobroliubov's esteem of the story stressed his utilitarian views since Dobroliubov demanded that an artist "speak about a cause . . . serve a social idea and . . . be true to reality, its needs, and ideals".[39] For Dostoevsky, who was always interested in the questions of aesthetic expression but who never asserted his affinity either to the "art for art's sake" or to the utilitarian direction in literature, art was an organic whole, with its own life and basic laws, and any demand, placed on art, denied it the most important principle, namely, the freedom of inspiration. Since such a belief meant that art, together with beauty, exists independently of man's laws and conceptions, it had to be permitted to develop unrestrained, without any conditions.[40] To force art to serve reality (and the social problems of the day) was, according to Dostoevsky, too presumptuous because the potential practical benefits from art, as advocated by the utilitarian critics, are in themselves too vague to be perceived.

During this period of the early sixties when much more significance was attributed to the examination of social and political ideas within literary works than to any other problem, some critics attempted to evaluate various literary merits of the texts. Among these investigators of Marko Vovchok's fiction were young D. Pisarev, K. Leont'ev, and M. de-Pule.

---

[38] F.M. Dostoevsky, "G. (Dobroliu)bov i vopros ob iskusstve," pp. 77-78.

[39] Ibid., pp. 83-84.

[40] Ibid., p. 84.

Even though D. Pisarev, the "enfant terrible" of the Chernyshevsky trend, is more known as the propagator of didacticism in literature, in his early literary critiques he could hardly be called the "annihilator of aesthetics". It was not until 1861-1862 that Pisarev attacked purely aesthetic theories about art, and some of this displeasure was aimed at the works of Pushkin and, to some degree, Lermontov. At this time, the critic saw Pushkin's only importance in his perfected Russian verse and in his role as a "great stylist".[41] However, while reviewing Marko Vovchok's tales, twice in 1859,[42] Pisarev noted that every respectable writer was also a priest of pure art.[43] Young Pisarev's utilitarian beliefs had not been as yet firmly expressed and that is why his psycholiterary analysis of Marko Vovchok has been appropriately included among the reviews studying the language and the stylistic devices of the author's stories.

Pisarev's laudatory remarks were not connected with Marko Vovchok's conscientious portrayal of reality (which he found commendable nonetheless) but with her ability to express artistically the life of the peasants. The critic refuted any possibility of "idealization"[44] in her

---

[41] D.I. Pisarev, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v shesti tomakh (S. Pg.: Obshchestvennaia pol'za, 1894), Vol. V, p. 79.

[42] For some unknown reason, Pisarev's second article did not appear in print until 1913. See M.D. Bernshtein's Zbirnyk statei, p. 318.

[43] D.I. Pisarev, Izbrannye proizvedeniia (Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1968), pp. 8-9.

[44] To Pisarev, idealization meant description of the national mode of life, the local coloring of factual material, and the tranquil tone of the language. See M. Bernshtein's Zbirnyk statei, pp. 164-69, 173.

stories and praised the simplicity of her style, the objectivity of the descriptions, but above all, the competency to unite harmoniously the language of folk poetry with her own writing.

> The tone of this narration is simple and refined in its simplicity; the abundance of constantly repeated epithets and proverbs, the measurement and the cadence of stress, the unusual direct musicality of rhythm are very reminiscent of the composition and tone of the folk songs, and sometimes, of the fairytales. . . .[45]

The critic stressed Marko Vovchok's knowledge of the character of the people and commended the artistic creativity with which the author supplemented and completed her stories based on this knowledge.[46] It is important to note that at this stage of his literary career, Pisarev was highly critical of didacticism in literature. Works that possessed this characteristic, which, incidentally, he did not find in Marko Vovchok's stories, Pisarev considered "banal" and asserted his belief about their non-relationship to free art.[47] According to young Pisarev, the most important aspects of an artistic product were the truthful depiction of reality (which could not be violated in the name of edification) and the aesthetic description of the author.

Another critic, who also evaluated the literary merits of Marko Vovchok's short stories and tales, was K. Leont'ev. Regarded as a

---

[45] M. Bernshtein, Zbirnyk statei, p. 153.

[46] Ibid., p. 154.

[47] Ibid., p. 206.

profound Russian thinker,[48] this conservatively opinionated critic opposed the dominant Realist school in literature because if its "repulsive realistic details" and the negative portrayal of life and found the language of Tolstoy, Turgenev, and Pisemskii simply "revolting".[49] In the second half of the nineteenth century when the majority of Russian critics devoted their efforts to the social content in literature, Leont'ev analyzed it from the aesthetic point of view and examined some of the literary devices employed by the authors.

His first article, "Za Marka Vovchka" (1859), was a rebuttal to Druzhinin's negative review in Biblioteka dlia chteniia. Paraphrasing and quoting directly from Druzhinin's treatise, Leont'ev expressed very few personal opinions. He termed Druzhinin's essay unclear because it failed to remain within the boundaries of the literary criticism by discussing politico-economic questions.[50] To Leont'ev, Druzhinin's article could not be considered a review but only a "misunderstanding" on the part of Biblioteka dlia chteniia.[51]

---

[48]For a more detailed presentation of K. Leont'ev and his beliefs see Stephen Lukashevich's Konstantin Leont'ev (1831-1891): A Study in Russian "Heroic Vitalism" (New York: Pageant Press, Inc., 1967) and K. Leontiev's Against the Current: Selections from the novels, essays, notes, and letters of Konstantin Leontiev (New York: Weybright and Talley, 1969). Leont'ev's work is henceforth cited as K. Leont'ev, Against the Current.

[49]K. Leont'ev, Against the Current, p. 237.

[50]A.V. Druzhinin, "Ukrainskie narodnye rasskazy Marka Vovchka," pp. 576-77.

[51]K. Leont'ev, "Za Marka Vovchka," Otechestvennye zapiski, CXXVII (1859), p. 120.

Two years later, in reviewing Marko Vovchok's stories "Igrushechka", "Instytutka", and "Chervonnyi korol'" (King of Hearts), Leont'ev analyzed the composition of the author's language: its conciseness and selective vocabulary. It is this essay of the critic which offers the reader a fresh outlook not only on Marko Vovchok's work but also on Russian literature in general. Leont'ev remained oblivious to the social themes and the realistic descriptions in Marko Vovchok's work and perceived her importance not (as Dobroliubov asserted) on the basis of faithful portrayal of peasant life and aspirations but in the original language of her writing: the literary devices and the innovation of the exposition, in other words, not in the content but in the form of the work. In fact, in the story "Likhoi chelovek" (Bad Man) Leont'ev disapproved of the author's personal observations because they were too psychologically-oriented and overshadowed the protagonist's speech.[52]

Making a brief critical summary of the literary techniques of other writers, such as Gogol, Turgenev, Grigorovich, and others, Leont'ev concluded that Marko Vovchok did not choose to apply arbitrarily their devices in her own stories. In his opinion the lack of numerous but conventional epithets, descriptions of Nature and the hero's physical appearance and coined phrases, all of which prevail in the works of her contemporaries, did not dimish Marko Vovchok's talent but actually established her originality:

> This is why we see in Marko Vovchok so much originality, so much fresh poetry and sincere pathos: one can see that all

---

[52]K. Leont'ev, "Po povodu rasskazov Marko Vovchok," Otechestvennye zapiski, CXXXV (1861), p. 37.

> this was not written to measure . . . but because of some special and relentless need.[53]

The critic found that even though one could not expect the author to create a new literary trend and that her stories were not firmly structured, he believed, nonetheless, that Marko Vovchok's simple language and preference for gentle ideas were more innovating than the topics and their presentations in the works of such realists as Turgenev, Shchedrin, and others.[54]

The most interesting of these critical studies which deal with the stylistic features of Marko Vovchok and, by far, the most literary evaluation of Narodni opovidannia was given in Russkoe slovo by M. de-Pule, a writer-aesthete who had made some concessions to the spirit of the times. For M. de-Pule, the most important component of an artistic production of literature was the "idea of the refined, which, together with goodness and benevolence, expresses the yearning of our spirit. . . ."[55] Nevertheless, the critic also permitted what he called a "second idea". By this he understood any message which could be deduced from the text: i e., the social distortion of society (as in Dead Souls) or the suffering of the best representatives of the epoch (Oblomov) and only this second idea and not art could serve the practical and social needs of mankind. However, M. de-Pule cautioned the authors of allowing this

---

[53] K. Leont'ev, "Po povodu rasskazov Marko Vovchok," p. 21.

[54] Ibid., p. 35. See also K. Leont'ev's Against the Current, pp. 238-39.

[55] M. de-Pule, "Ukrainskie narodnye rasskazy Marka Vovchka," Russkoe slovo (Oct. 1859), p. 14.

extraneous idea to surmount the artistic element, in which case, only an abstract concept would be presented, which would then belong to the realm of fantasy.[56]

In reviewing Narodni opovidannia, M. de-Pule justified the sometimes unilateral descriptions and the brevity of the stories and voiced his opinion, which differed sharply from that of the other critics (such as Dostoevsky) who reproved Marko Vovchok for these same elements. Since Narodni opovidannia was written in the form of poetic sketches (ocherki), that is, in a brief and concise method, de-Pule said one could not expect total presentation of the characters and ideas. Complete understanding of the picture had to be achieved by the reader himself with the aid of the author's manipulations of the language: the lyrical places within the text, the descriptions of Nature, and others.[57] Therefore, the poetic character of the sketch was rendered by the author's skillful use of the language: the metaphors, comparisons, and epithets, which Marko Vovchok often obtained from folklore.

> The poetic sketches of Marko Vovchok are done with an unusually gentle, but strong, talented hand. The personages, the scenes of Nature, as portrayed by the author, are so airy . . . that by imitating her, one would not be able to distinguish . . . either a light or a shadow.[58]

However, with all the positive traits in the stories, the critic reproached Marko Vovchok for overburdening some of her characters with

---

[56] M. de-Pule, "Ukrainskie narodnye rasskazy Marka Vovchka," p. 14.

[57] Ibid., pp. 7-8.

[58] Ibid., p. 8.

poetic language to the extent where it appeared false and affected (such an example de-Pule found in the behavior of the heroine Olesia in the story "Kozachka"). He advised moderation in the linguistic depiction of the life of the people and maintained that since the writing of Marko Vovchok's sketches was legendary and was based on folk poetry,[59] the author should exercise caution in utilizing excessively only this kind of speech and should alternate it with the ordinary literary language.

Unfortunately, the critical essays, like those of M. de-Pule, which examined the language and style of a literary work, were extremely rare at this time. As has been said, most of the literary critics devoted their efforts to ideological disputes about the social content in literature and were not prepared to speak about its intrinsic qualities, such as the artistic construction, the lexicon, and the utilization of oral speech. Especially the last feature, the stylistically developed inner narrative, which has been greatly developed by N. Leskov, was widely employed by Marko Vovchok in most of her stories. Known among scholars of Russian literature as skaz, that is, a "narrative told by a fictitious narrator, rather than by the author directly",[60] it permits a great variety of innovations of the language and style. Moreover, the author's absence produces a highly individual and original language of each hero and heroine, which in turn attracts the reader's attention to the peculiarities of the language that create the hero's image. Such an

---

[59] M. de-Pule, "Ukrainskie narodnye rasskazy Marka Vovchka," pp. 11-12.

[60] William E. Harkins, Dictionary of Russian Literature (New York: Philosophical Library, 1956), p. 360.

analysis, which was based exclusively on the literary work, finally gained importance in the early decades of the twentieth century in the studies of the Russian Formalists, such as B. Eichenbaum and V. Vinogradov.

In addition to the critical reviews which have given us good indication how the criticism greeted Marko Vovchok in the first decades of her literary career, some Russian authors also expressed their opinions with respect to the stories and novels of their fellow-writer.

Perhaps one of the most avid followers and admirers of Marko Vovchok was A. Hertzen, a noted publicist and the émigré leader of the Russian revolutionaries in London. Having become acquainted with her Rasskazy, he impatiently awaited meeting their author. In 1859, in his letter to M. Reikhel', a friend of the family, he stated: "I want to see Marko Vovchok very much; her book is such a beautiful thing that I also read it to Tata [Hertzen's daughter] and suggested that it should be translated into English."[61] Two months later he wrote that Marko Vovchok would take an important place in Russian literature, but she needed to enlarge her scope of topics. This attempt he already saw in "Igrushechka" but found that the condensed, lifeless character of baryshnia (young lady) gave the impression of being forcibly created.[62] From Marko Vovchok's biographic studies we know that she always continued to work on her stories--improving and rewriting them. Thus, it seems apparent from the following letter of A. Hertzen to Marko Vovchok that his judgment of "Igrushechka" prompted the author to rewrite it:

---

[61] A. Hertzen, Sobranie sochinenii v tridtsati tomakh (Moskva: Akademiia Nauk SSSR, 1962), Vol. XXVI, p. 278.

[62] Ibid., p. 290.

> I reread your "Igrushechka". A marvellous thing; you have corrected it, and except for two or three trifles and half as many Little-Russian [Ukrainian] words, it would be the purest diamond. I read it aloud, and it made the same impression on everyone as it did on me. . . .[63]

Another story which Hertzen praised highly was "Chervonnyi korol'". He considered it a work of genius, and it was probably under his direction that it was translated into English.[64] I.S. Aksakov, one of the representatives of the Slavophile movement, also considered this story her best work.[65] It was Ivan Turgenev, meticulous with his own writing, who voiced his dissatisfaction with this story:

> The story itself I did not like: it is not fully developed--it seems as though you are also hurrying here--and besides, its language is too careless and too mottled with Little-Russianisms.[66]

In his letter to the critic K. Leont'ev, he stated that ". . . it seems to me that this story is her least successful, even though its basic idea is true to life, as it is always with Marko Vovchok."[67]

The novel Zhivaia dusha, which has been considered autobiographical, has been negatively appraised by N. Leskov who found it "monstrous . . . poor in content" and explained its failure by the fact

---

[63] A. Hertzen, Sobranie sochinenii v tridtsati tomakh (Moskva: Akademiia Nauk SSSR, 1963), Vol. XXVII, kn. 1, p. 19.

[64] Ibid., pp. 45, 47, 75, 99.

[65] I.S. Aksakov, Ivan Sergeevich Aksakov v ego pis'makh (Moskva: Tipografiia M.G. Volchaninova, 1892), Vol. III, p. 366.

[66] I. Turgenev, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem v dvadtsati vos'mi tomakh: Pis'ma, Vol. IV, pp. 57-58.

[67] Ibid., p. 136.

that it was written abroad.[68] Leskov's assertion is incorrect since Zhivaia dusha was written in Russia, and, ironically, the novel Zapiski prichetnika (Sexton's Notes), which Leskov approved as being "truthful and artistic",[69] was written abroad.

N. Chernyshevsky, another famous Russian writer, publicist, and critic remained very much in favor of Marko Vovchok's talent and while in exile considered publishing Marko Vovchok's collected works. In 1889, he wrote that Marko Vovchok, the "most talented novelist of the post-Gogol period",

> . . . did not have that high personal attitude of Turgenev and Count Tolstoy, did not possess that close personal friendship with the journalists like Goncharov and Dostoevsky (during the first period of his activity when Dostoevsky's reputation was established). Is this why she was praised less? Maybe a complete collection of her works would be justified? . . . For this, I would do everything I can. . . .[70]

Even though Chernyshevsky never succeeded in writing an analysis of Marko Vovchok's fiction, he stated in one of his letters to V. Lavrov, the editor of Russkaia mysl' (Russian Thought), that he would break his promise never to write about Russian literature in order to compose an article about Marko Vovchok's works.[71]

---

[68] N.S. Leskov, Sobranie sochinenii v odinadtsati tomakh (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1958), Vol. X, p. 91.

[69] Ibid., p. 92.

[70] N.G. Chernyshevsky, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v piatnadtsati tomakh (Moskva: Gosud. izd-vo khud. literatury, 1950), Vol. XV, p. 831.

[71] Ibid.

Another meritorious opinion of Marko Vovchok was expressed by the noted Russian satirist Saltykov-Shchedrin. In examining Marko Vovchok's tales for children, Saltykov said that the fairytales "Pro deviat'okh brativ-rozbiinykiv i pro desiatu sestrytsiu Haliu" and "Nevil'nychka" would be very beneficial for Russian children, since they would be much more educational than the moralistic children's tales of that period:

> Marko Vovchok does not place before her any anticipated goals; he [Marko Vovchok] does not promise any favors for good deeds and no punishments for the bad ones. He simply describes how difficult life can be in this world, how the vivacious and the strong overcome this difficult life, and how others, also vivacious and strong, grow tired under its yoke.[72]

Saltykov's only reservation about the two tales was their melodramatic and improbable endings. While one cannot deny the ambiguity of the conclusion in "Nevil'nychka", one should not, as Saltykov has done, hastily conclude that this was the result of Marko Vovchok's inability to properly end her fairytales. In both of these works the author consciously utilized and blended together folkloristic romantic elements and social messages behind them, and in some instances the romantic tone became so intense that it appeared to produce a fabulous picture. For Saltykov, though, this structure of the tale remained incomprehensible. As will be yet discussed in our conclusion, this inability of Saltykov to appreciate "Nevil'nychka" by Marko Vovchok was obviously due to the fact that in this work the author used romantic devices (which she might have introduced to meet the demands of the Ukrainian critic P. Kulish), which

---

[72] M. Saltykov-Shchedrin, "Skazki Marka Vovchka," in Sobranie sochinenii v dvadtsati tomakh (Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1966), Vol. V, p. 423.

conflicted with her otherwise realist way of writing.

Thus, it may be surmised that a greatly favorable response to Marko Vovchok's works on the part of the socio-utilitarian critics (such as Dobroliubov), as well as a somewhat repressed positive opinion of the critics-aesthetes (Druzhinin, Leont'ev), from the late 1850's until the 1870's (when the author chose to leave the literary scene) played an important role in popularizing her writing. However, the critics Tkachev, Shelgunov, and Skabichevskii, who appeared after them, were often more critical with the author's work than their predecessors and frequently expressed their beliefs that Marko Vovchok's stories and novels were belated in their description of past events. Chernyshevsky's solitary high opinion during this period of Marko Vovchok and his concern to publish her complete works were virtually unheard because his opinions were restricted to his letters.

In his book on Russian literature, the critic Skabichevskii maintained the theory that Marko Vovchok owed her popularity to the coincidental appearance of her works at the time when there prevailed enthusiasm for the improvement of peasant life.[73] His no less uncompromising judgment that "her works today are almost forgotten"[74] might have been an exemplary guideline to some of the critics in the 1890's, who seemed to echo Skabichevskii's view.[75] A series of unsigned critical responses,

---

[73]A.M. Skabichevskii, Istoriia noveishei russkoi literatury 1848-1908gg. (S. Pg.: Tip. M.A. Aleksandrova, 1909), p. 213.

[74]Quoted by O. Zasenko, Marko Vovchok: Zhyttia, tvorchist', mistse v istorii literatury (Kyiv: AN URSR, 1964), p. 261.

[75]M. Bernshtein, Zbirnyk statei, pp. 297-98, 302.

published in various Russian journals at the end of the nineteenth century, clearly demonstrates that some critics only iterated convictions of their more noted predecessors, such as N. Dobroliubov.[76] Other examiners, who briefly analyzed Marko Vovchok's literary production or reviewed the new editions of her stories published for the peasants, did not state any new or profound opinions. The summary and conclusion of the attitudes of the nineteenth century Russian critics to Marko Vovchok's writing can also be inferred from those literary facts which are related to her role in Ukrainian literature and her reputation among nineteenth-century Ukrainian critics.

---

[76] M. Bernshtein, Zbirnyk statei, pp. 300, 303, 307-11.

CHAPTER IV

MARKO VOVCHOK IN RUSSIAN AND UKRAINIAN LITERATURES

In this chapter, we will evaluate Marko Vovchok as an author. We believe that it will not be too presumptuous on our part to claim that Marko Vovchok's significance is greater in Ukrainian literature than in Russian literature. This can be established on the basis of certain factors. Firstly, we must consider the author's world-view and her association with the intellectual representatives of her time. Secondly, the interest of the critics in her writing is extremely important because it allows us to see different sides of the author. It also permits us to judge the popularity of her works. And thirdly, the value of the author can be determined on the basis of her influence on aspiring young writers.

While we have dealt exclusively with Marko Vovchok's Russian critics, we are convinced that the views of certain Ukrainian critics are equally important, particularly because they often expressed opinions which were kindred to those of their Russian colleagues. Furthermore, we feel that a more definitive picture of Marko Vovchok as writer and the diverse analyses of the Russian critics can be established with the aid of the Ukrainian critical views.

One of the principal reasons for Marko Vovchok's popularity in the late 1850's and 1860's was the fact that she belonged to the realist movement. Despite her ethnographic interests and, we might say, her life-long preoccupation with customs, morés, and other studies

of the people's tradition, all of which were characteristic, in the first place, of the Romantic writers, Marko Vovchok remained a realist throughout her literary career. But her affiliation with this important and dominant school in nineteenth century Russian literature, which was largely responsible for establishing acclaim of the critics, accounted for the unfavorable analyses of the author's work from the 1870's to the 1890's. As we have already seen, on the eve of serf emancipation when Realism was at its height Marko Vovchok's descriptions of the deplorable condition of the peasants earned her extensive praise from the Russian critics, whose aim was to study her objectivity and adherence to the social problems of the day rather than the artistic value of her literary product. Since the main feature of Marko Vovchok's creative work (here, we refer primarily to her stories and novels written in Russian) was the realistic concept of the portrayal of reality, that is, the unbiased view of factual material and the lack of authorial expositions, it was this aspect of her fiction which was considered commendable, and any aesthetic study of her prose was virtually nonexistent. Marko Vovchok continued to write in this manner, even when literature and criticism began to be permeated by new tendencies and directions. It is not without reason that her novels Zhivaia dusha, Teploe gnezdyshko, V glushi and others, which appeared in the 1870's and 1880's, at the time when literature began to move away from Realism, but which were still written in the strict realist tradition, were negatively appraised because the critics began to analyze them from the modern point of view.

Already in the early 1870's the realist school in belles-lettres and criticism was very limited. This was largely due to the

changing attitudes in Russian literature toward didactic and socially-oriented works. The influx of these realist novels and stories, which were similar in content, generated little originality, and the readers found them boring and unconvincing. As early as 1861, Dostoevsky wrote that in her Russian stories (in "Masha", for example) Marko Vovchok presented significant ideas in a tasteless and ridiculous manner.[1] In the 1860's and 1870's, Dostoevsky's attitude toward realist writers (including I. Turgenev) became more negative. In addition to personal reasons, there was also a literary basis for this opinion of Turgenev because Dostoevsky found it impossible to appreciate Realism. Moreover, many consistent realists (such as Grigorovich) were often too preoccupied with the faithful depiction of reality within their work and neglected its artistic construction. Such a practice was too significant to be ignored by other more conscientious writers. As D. S. Mirsky justly pointed out, criticism of realist literature was not so much a result of the propagation of the "art for art's sake" doctrine as it was the outcome of a "natural and essentially healthy protest of the literary spirit against all-pervading utilitarianism of the preceding age"[2] which predominated during this time, and authors began to search for new forms of expression. The new schools of literature, Naturalism and Impressionism, which, like Realism, were based on a positivist world view but which maintained different objectives, and the theories and convictions of L. Tolstoy and F. Dostoevsky, both of

---

[1] F. M. Dostoevsky, "G. (Dobroliu)bov i vopros ob iskusstve," p. 79.

[2] D. S. Mirsky, A History of Russian Literature (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949), pp. 333-34. See also Avrahm Yarmolinsky's The Russian Literary Imagination (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1969), p. 197.

whom rejected the principles of Realism, came into existence and writers, such as A. Chekhov (in Russian literature) and I. Franko and M. Kotsiubyns'kyi (in Ukrainian literature) were quickly acclaimed the new leaders. Among these new literary trends the realist novels and stories of Marko Vovchok became outdated. Ivan Franko, for example, who did not find anything "prophetic and accusing"[3] even in her Narodni opovidannia and who esteemed in this work for the inherent beauty of the Ukrainian language, justly compared Marko Vovchok's Russian writing to that of the second-rate author N. Kokhanovskaia (1825-1884).

As we have mentioned on the preceding pages, on one hand, the socio-utilitarian critics praised Marko Vovchok's truthful and realistic portrayal of life and ignored the intrinsic qualities of a particular work. On the other hand, her steadfast association with the dominant realist school was responsible for the neglect of her production, especially in the last quarter of the XIX century. In Ukrainian literature, where elements of the romantic movement were still intact, negative appreciation of Marko Vovchok's writing was conducted from still another point of view, namely, from a romantic criterion which required that an author express his personal convictions in his work. Marko Vovchok's first publisher and critic Panteleimon Kulish greatly contributed to this depreciation of the author. As writer, poet, and translator of the Ukrainian romantic school, but above all ethnographer, he at first (1857) recognized the beauty and poetic expression in Marko Vovchok's tales and, in addition,

---

[3] Ivan Franko, "Nove ukr. opovidannia M-a V-a," in Tvory v dvadtsiaty tomakh (Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oi literatury, 1955), Vol. XVII, p. 410.

praised the independent narration of the heroines.[4] In 1860, however, Kulish retracted his former views and emphasized the difference (not in favor of Marko Vovchok) between the writing of Marko Vovchok and that of the Romantic poet T. Shevchenko.

Even though he saw in Marko Vovchok's stories only incomplete sketches of the peasants and said that she was unable to find her own distinct and original manner of writing, it was actually her non-commitment to any leading ideas (such as Shevchenko's vision of an independent Ukraine within a federated Slavic community) that was the basis of Kulish's reprobation. For the Romantic writer Kulish, who was not fond of the scrupulous objectively with which factual material was incorporated into a Realist work, absence of authorial concepts and beliefs was one of Marko Vovchok's weaknesses as an author. Contrary to Marko Vovchok's stories Kulish placed Shevchenko's nationalistic poems in which the poet appealed to the masses for the abolition of serfdom and the independence of the Ukraine. In his analysis of Marko Vovchok's most recent publication ("Instytutka"),[5] Kulish voiced his disappointment that the author was unable to follow Shevchenko's method of writing and could not break new ground for the development of Ukrainian literature. The injustice of P. Kulish's criticism cannot be denied, particularly when one realizes the influence of Marko Vovchok on aspiring young Ukrainian writers in the XIX and the XX centuries. However, his opinions help us understand some of the arguments

---

[4] P. Kulish, "Vzgliad na malorossiiskuiu slovestnost' po povodu vykhoda v svet knigi Narodni opovidannia Marka Vovchka," in Vybrani tvory, pp. 505-507. Henceforth cited as P. Kulish, "Vzgliad".

[5] P. Kulish, "Perednie slovo do hromady," in Vybrani tvory (Kyiv: Dnipro, 1969), p. 511.

Russian critics expressed about her stories and novels at the end of the last century. They, as well as Kulish, tended to view Marko Vovchok's importance with an outlook different from hers, and this very often assigned the author an unworthy place in literature.

Despite Kulish's abnegation of Marko Vovchok's manner of writing, and many issues revolving around her literary career, Marko Vovchok's valuable contribution to Ukrainian literature was generally accepted by her contemporaries and remains uncontested in our time. She is acknowledged a prominent figure in Ukrainian literature, especially in her contribution to the development of the Ukrainian language.

Taras Shevchenko, who by this time was identified as the national bard, called her his spiritual daughter and found it impossible (if not sacrilegious) to correct her works, which he considered a "fountain of truth and beauty".[6] For many witers, such as M. Chaika, D. Mordovets', Hanna Barvinok, and others,[7] who were contributing with Marko Vovchok to the magazine Osnova, her fiction served as an example and a guide. Just a few years after the appearance of Narodni opovidannia some twenty authors published stories which were similar to it both in form and content. Traces of Marko Vovchok's style can be found also in I. Nechui-Levyts'kyi's and Panas Myrnyi's novels. She continued to be a teacher to aspiring Ukrainian writers and her literary legacy is very much evident in the work of the contemporary Ukrainian authors O. Honchar, I. Le, and others.

---

[6]Quoted by B. Lobach-Zhuchenko, Litopys, p. 37.

[7]B. S. Burak et al, Istoriia ukrains'koi literatury u vos'my tomakh (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1968), Vol. III, p. 436.

But perhaps nowhere was Marko Vovchok's popularity and influence greater than in Western Ukraine. A renowned Bukovinian writer, Iu. Fed'kovych, who himself was under Marko Vovchok's influence, considered T. Shevchenko "the sun", Kvitka--"the moon", and Marko Vovchok--"the star"[8] of Ukrainian literature. Ivan Franko also maintained a high opinion of Marko Vovchok and emphasized her immense talent and her contribution to the development of Ukrainian literature. He believed that she was the most important Ukrainian writer of the 1850's and regarded her language, which was melodious and simple with its rich lexicon, her best asset.[9]

Contemporary scholars of Ukrainian literature (both Soviet and Western) have also stressed her importance as a Ukrainian writer. She is credited with innovating the ethnic-descriptive short story and permeating it with social overtones.[10] It is unfortunate that the content rather than the language has been emphasized in her work, and throughout the years very little attention has been given to the investigation of Marko Vovchok's language and style.[11] It is obvious that these questions are

---

[8]Iu. Fed'kovych, Tvory v dvokh tomakh (Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oi literatury, 1960), Vol. II, p. 405.

[9]Ivan Franko, "Mariia Markovych (Marko Vovchok): Posmertna zhadka," in Tvory v dvadtsiaty tomakh (Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oi literatury), Vol. XVII, p. 446.

[10]P. Kolesnyk, "Ukrains'ke opovidannia," Antolohiia ukrains'koho opovidannia v 4kh tomakh (Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oi literatury), Vol. I, p. 446.

[11]The Ph.D. dissertation of O. Doroshkevych Ukrains'ka proza Marka Vovchka (The Ukrainian Prose of Marko Vovchok, Kyiv, 1943) and the M.A. dissertation by the same name of Y. Zorych (Ottawa, 1966), together

of a different nature and it is not without reason that Russian criticism of the nineteenth century was not concerned with them. This is especially true with regard to her Ukrainian writing which was never the focal point of Russian criticism. Marko Vovchok's contribution to and her importance in Ukrainian literature, as well as her utilization of inner monologue (skaz) in Russian and Ukrainian alike, could be worthwhile studies in the future.

---

with the book of I. Hrytsiutenko, Estetychna funktsiia khudozhn'oho slova v ukrains'kii prozi 30-60kh rokiv XIX stolittia (Aesthetic Function of the Artistic Word in Ukrainian Prose from the 1830's to the 1860's, L'viv 1972), all of which deal with the language of Marko Vovchok's prose, are examples of very sporadic attempts to study this problem.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

In the preceding chapters we have examined how the Russian critics responded to Marko Vovchok's writing and how their views and critiques reflected the tendencies within the literary schools. On the basis of this information, we also established Marko Vovchok's dissimilar position in Russian and Ukrainian literatures.

Despite the fact that the most characteristic and influential school of criticism in the beginning of the second half of the nineteenth century was utilitarian, other attitudes, were nevertheless present and to them we attribute the varied views of Marko Vovchok's stories and novels. Reviewers, such as A. Druzhinin and F. Dostoevsky, as well as M. de-Pule, K. Leont'ev, and young D. Pisarev in analyzing Marko Vovchok's work have given their readers new insights and attitudes with which to view literature. One may safely assume that because of their small but conscientious efforts Russian literature did not fall under a complete tutelage of the social critics.

In the third quarter of the XIX century, Marko Vovchok's stories and novels provided many Russian critics with an opportunity to reveal their convictions and programs and either acclaim or disapprove of the author's work. At first, when Realism was the accepted mode of writing and Marko Vovchok was one of its adherents, her popularity was rapidly established, and she was considered by the so-called "democratic" critics, such as N. Dobroliubov, one of the best representatives of her

time. Since most of their attention was devoted to establishing the value of literature on the basis of descriptions of social conditions within the Empire, these critics were inclined to overemphasize Marko Vovchok's importance in Russian and Ukrainian literatures and were unaware of her other attributes or possible shortcomings. Of course, in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, criticism, literature, and philosophy no longer totally accepted positivism and the preoccupation with reality and social ills ceased. Russian intelligentsia became increasingly aware of more modern ideas and began to condemn writers who continued to write in the realist tradition. Authors, such as Marko Vovchok, could not maintain their former popularity and started to write in a different manner. However, this was not to Marko Vovchok's advantage. She was never able to be convincing in her Russian works and her mastery of style and language never equaled the one she enjoyed in Ukrainian literature.

In Ukrainian literature, on the other hand, Marko Vovchok's importance was never doubted. Except for a brief time when her authorship of Narodni opovidannia was under scrutiny, her contribution to the development of Ukrainian literature was always emphasized. This, however, was achieved on criteria different from those in Russian literature.

While Marko Vovchok was viewed by the Russian critics as a realist writer and their positions were rather those taken by either the civic critics or those wishing to study the intrinsic qualities of literary works, Ukrainian critics studied Marko Vovchok's stories and novels from the romantic point of view. P. Kulish, her first publisher, was especially demanding in his advice that she write in the manner of

the Ukrainian poet T. Shevchenko. Kulish found it extremely difficult to accept her objectively and the absence of the author's personal views and comments. At the end of her life, when she continued to work on her Ukrainian stories, Marko Vovchok obliged Kulish, as well as T. Shevchenko, and wrote several fairytales in a romantic view.

It is without any doubt that the most significant factor in contributing to the development of Ukrainian literature was her excellent knowledge of the Ukrainian language, and the customs and beliefs of the people. Her influence on young Ukrainian writers was so great that Ivan Franko, the noted Ukrainian author and critic, acclaimed her one of the great Ukrainian literati, while he considered her a second-rate Russian writer. This variety of opinions among Russian critics (together with Ukrainian criticism, which was still under the influence of Romanticism) produced a multilateral study of Marko Vovchok's writing and the literary criticism of the nineteenth century. Through these critiques we were able to witness the development of a talented, multilingual writer, whose greatest misfortune was the necessity, rather than the natural desire, to write in Russian. Her Russian prose, written hurriedly at the time when I. Turgenev and F. Dostoevsky were acclaimed masters of Russian literature, never achieved the status enjoyed by these other authors. Nevertheless, despite her shortcomings, the Russian critics found her writing important enough to be reviewed and discovered certain significant features which are most evident in her Ukrainian works.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Works by Marko Vovchok

Vovchok, Marko, Tvory v shesty tomakh. Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oi literatury, 1956.

_____, Sobranie sochinenii v trekh tomakh. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Izvestiia, 1957.

Works about Marko Vovchok

Akademiia Nauk URSR, Marko Vovchok: Statti i doslidzhennia. Kyiv: AN URSR, 1957.

Anon., "Sochineniia Marka Vovchka, Zhivaia dusha," Zaria, No. 10 (1869), pp. 246-68.

Antonovich, M., "Iz zametok o zhurnalakh," in Literaturno-kriticheskie stat'i. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1961, pp. 332-42.

Bernshtein, M.D., Marko Vovchok v krytytsi: Zbirnyk statei, retsenzii, vyslovliuvan'. Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oi literatury, 1955.

_____, "Marko Vovchok v krytytsi," Radians'ke literaturoznavstvo, No. 18 (1955), pp. 115-20.

Boiko, V., Marko Vovchok. Kyiv-Leipzig: Ukrains'ka nakladnia, 1918.

Brandis, E., Marko Vovchok. Moskva: Molodaia gvardiia, 1968.

Cundy, Percival, "Marko Vovchok," The Ukrainian Quarterly, III (Winter 1947), 116-25.

De-Pule, M., "Ukrainskie narodnye rasskazy Marko Vovchok," Russkoe slovo, October 1859, pp. 1-15.

Dobroliubov, N.O., "Features for the Characterization of the Russian Common People," in Selected Philosophical Essays. Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House, 1956, pp. 466-547.

Dostoevsky, F.M., "G. (Dobroliu)bov i vopros ob iskusstve," in Dnevnik pisatelia za 1873 god. Paris: YMCA Press, no date given, pp. 46-98.

Druzhinin, A.V., "Ukrainskie narodnye rasskazy Marka Vovchka," in Sobranie sochinenii, Vol. VII. S. Pg.: Tipografiia Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk, 1866, pp. 567-79.

Franko, Ivan, "Nove ukr. opovidannia M-a V-a," in Tvory v dvadtsiaty tomakh, Vol. XVII. Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oi literatury, 1955, pp. 408-10.

_____, "Mariia Markovych (Marko Vovchok): Posmertna zhadka," in Tvory v dvadtsiaty tomakh, Vol. XVII. Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oi literatury, 1955, pp. 444-47.

Hertzen, A.I., "Biblioteka doch' Senkovskogo," Kolokol, No. 71 (1859), pp. 593-94.

Kostomarov, M., "Ukrainskie narodnye rasskazy Marko Vovchok," Sovremennik, LXXV (May 1859), 103-13.

Kotliarevskii, A.A., "Narodni opovidannia Marka Vovchka," Otechestvennye zapiski, CXXIII (1859), 1-14.

Krutikova, N.Ie., Storinky tvorchoho zhyttia: Marko Vovchok v zhytti i pratsi. Kyiv: Dnipro, 1965.

Kulish, Panteleimon, "Vzgliad na malorossiiskuiu slovestnost' po povodu vykhoda v svet knigi Narodni opovidannia Marka Vovchka, in Vybrani tvory. Kyiv: Dnipro, 1969, pp. 500-507.

_____, "Perednie slovo do hromady," in Vybrani tvory. Kyiv: Dnipro, 1969, pp. 508-16.

Leont'ev, K., "Za Marka Vovchka," Otechestvennye zapiski, CXXVII (1859), 112-20.

_____, "Po povodu rasskazov Marko Vovchok," Otechestvennye zapiski, CXXXV (1861), 1-37.

Lobach-Zhuchenko, B.B., Litopys zhyttia i tvorchosti Marka Vovchka. Kyiv: Dnipro, 1969.

Markovych, M.O., Tvory Marka Vovchka: Zhyttiepys i zhyttiepysni materiialy, Vol. I. Kyiv-Leipzig: Ukrains'ka nakladnia, 1913.

_____, "Pis'ma M.A. Markovych (Marka Vovchka)," Literaturnoe nasledstvo: Iz parizhskogo arkhiva I.S. Turgeneva, LXXIII, kniga 2. Moskva: Nauka, 1964, 249-302.

Mohylians'kyi, O.P., "Pysems'kyi pro Marka Vovchka," Radians'ke literaturoznavstvo, No. 2 (1960), pp. 117-20.

Pisarev, D.I., "Narodnye ukrainskie rasskazy Marka Vovchka," in Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v shesti tomakh, Vol. I. S. Pg.: Obshchestvennaia pol'za, 1894, pp. 70-74.

Saltykov-Shchedrin, M.E., "Skazki Marka Vovchka," in Sobranie sochinenii v dvadtsati tomakh, Vol. V. Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1966, pp. 422-24.

Shelgunov, N.V., "Glukhaia pora," Delo, No. 4 (1870), pp. 4-8, 14-28.

Skabichevskii, A.M., "Protivopolozhnaia krainost'," Otechestvennye zapiski, CLXXIX (1868), 19-50.

Tamarchenko, D., Marko Vovchok. Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oi literatury, 1946.

Taranenko, M., Marko Vovchok: Literaturnyi portret. Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oi literatury, 1958.

Tkachev, P.N., "Podrastaiushchie sily," in Izbrannye sochineniia, Vol. 1. Moskva: Izd-vo Vsesoiuznogo obshchestva polit-katorzhan i ssylno-poselentsev, 1932, pp. 274-325.

Zasenko, Oleksa, Marko Vovchok: Zhyttia, tvorchist', mistse v istorii literatury. Kyiv: AN URSR, 1964.

_____, Marko Vovchok i zarubizhni literatury. Kyiv: AN URSR, 1959.

General Sources

Akademiia Nauk SSSR, Istoriia russkoi kritiki, Vol. I. Moskva: Izd-vo AN SSSR, 1958.

Aksakov, I.S., Ivan Sergeevich Aksakov v ego pis'makh, Vol. III. Moskva: Tipografiia M.G. Volchaninova, 1892.

Annenkov, P.V., The Extraordinary Decade. Translated by I.R. Titunik. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1968.

Azadovskii, M.K., Istoriia russkoi fol'kloristiki, Vol. I. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe uchebno-podagogicheskoe izdatel'stvo ministerstva prosveshcheniia RSFSR, 1958.

Bagrii, A.V., Russkaia literatura XIX-go--pervoi chetverti XX-go vv. Baku: Izd-vo Vostochnogo fakul'teta A.G.U., 1926.

Belinsky, V.G., Izbrannye filosofskie sochineniia, Vols. I and II. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury, 1948.

Berezina, V.G., Istoriia russkoi zhurnalistiki XVIII-XIX vekov. Moskva: Vysshaia shkola, 1963.

Berlin, Isaiah, "Russia and 1848," The Slavonic and East European Review, XXVI (1947-48), 341-60.

Bernshtein, M.D., Ukrains'ka literaturna krytyka 50-70kh rokiv XIX st. Kyiv: AN URSR, 1959.

Bilets'kyi, O., Zibrannia prats' u piaty tomakh, Vol. II. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1965.

Buriak, B.S. et al, Istoriia ukrains'koi literatury u vos'my tomakh, Vol. III. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1968.

Chernyshevsky, N.G., Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v piatnadtsati tomakh, Vol. XV. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1950.

Dement'ev, A.G., Ocherki po istorii russkoi zhurnalistiki 1840-1850gg. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1951.

Efremov, S.I., Istoriia ukrains'koho pys'menstva. Vydannia chetverte. Kyiv-Leipzig, 1919.

Engel'gardt, N., Istoriia russkoi literatury XIX stoletiia, Vol. II. S. Pg.: Izd-vo A.S. Suvorina, 1903.

Fed'kovych, Iu., Tvory v dvokh tomakh, Vol. II. Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oi literatury, 1960.

Hare, Richard, Russian Literature from Pushkin to the Present Day. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1947.

Harkins, William E., Dictionary of Russian Literature. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956.

Hawgood, J.A., "1848 in Central Europe," The Slavonic and East European Review, XXVI (1947-48), 314-28.

Hertzen, A.I., Sobranie sochinenii v tridtsati tomakh, Vols. XXVI, XXVII (kn. 1), and XXX (kn. 1). Moskva: AN SSSR, 1962-64.

Hingley, Ronald, Nihilists. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1967.

_____, Russian Writers and Society 1825-1904. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1967.

Hrushevsky, M., A History of Ukraine. Archon Books, 1970.

Kolesnyk, P., "Ukrains'ke opovidannia," Antolohiia ukrains'koho opovidannia v 4kh tomakh, Vol. I. Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oi literatury, 1960, pp. 5-51.

Koz'min, B., Literatura i istoriia. Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1969.

Kropotkin, P., Ideals and Realities in Russian Literature. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1970.

Kubijovyc, V., ed., Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia, Vol. I. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963.

Leontiev, Konstantin, Against the Current: Selections from the novels, essays, notes, and letters of Konstantin Leontiev. Translated by George Reavey. New York: Weybright and Talley, 1969.

Leskov, N.S., Sobranie sochinenii v odinadtsati tomakh, Vol. X. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1958.

Lukashevich, Stephen, Konstantin Leontev (1831-1891): A Study in Russian "Heroic Vitalism". New York: Pageant Press, Inc., 1967.

Masaryk, T.G., The Spirit of Russia, Vol. I. London: Allen and Unwin, 1961.

McLean, Hugh, "On the Style of Leskovian Skaz," Harvard Slavic Studies, Vol. II. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954, pp. 297-322.

_____, ed., Russian Thought and Politics. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Mirsky, D.S., A History of Russian Literature. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949.

Mordovchenko, N., Russkaia kritika pervoi chetverti XIX veka. Moskva: AN SSSR, 1959.

Okhrimenko, P.P., Istoriia ukrainskoi literatury. Moskva: Izd-vo Prosveshchenie, 1970.

Ornatskaia, T.I., "Fol'kloristicheskie interesy Turgeneva," Turgenevskii sbornik: Materialy k polnomu sobraniiu sochinenii i pisem I.S. Turgeneva, IV. Leningrad: Nauka, 1968, 240-50.

Ovsianiko-Kulikovskii, D.N., Sobranie sochinenii: Istoriia russkoi intelligentsii, Vol. VII. S. Pg.: Obshchestvennaia pol'za, 1911.

Parménie, A. et C. Bonnier de la Chapelle, Histoire d'un éditeur et de ses auteurs: P.J. Hetzel (Stahl). Paris: Editions Albin Michel, 1953.

Petrov, N.I., Ocherki istorii ukrainskoi literatury XIX stoletiia. Kiev: Tip-a I. i A. Davidenko, 1884.

Pisarev, D.I., Izbrannye proizvedeniia. Leningrad: Izd-vo Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1968.

Pisarev, D.I., Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v shesti tomakh, Vol. V. S. Pg.: Obshchestvennaia pol'za, 1894.

Pypin, A.N. and V.D. Spasovich, Istoriia slavianskikh literatur, Vol. I. S. Pg.: Tipografiia M.M. Stasiulevicha, 1879.

Riasanovsky, Nicholas V., A History of Russia. New York: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Savchenko, Fedir, The Suppression of the Ukrainian Activities in 1876. Edited by the Harvard Committee on Ukrainian Studies. Munchen: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1970.

Shevchenko, Taras, Kobzar. Winnipeg: I. Tyktor, 1960.

Skabichevskii, A., Sochineniia A. Skabichevskogo, Vol. II. S. Pg.: Tip-a Iu. N. Erlikh, 1903.

_____, Istoriia noveishei russkoi literatury 1848-1908gg. S. Pg.: Tip. M.A. Aleksandrova, 1909.

Slonim, Marc, The Epic of Russian Literature. New York: Oxford University Press, 1950.

Solov'ev, S., Ocherki po istorii russkoi literatury XIX veka. S. Pg.: Tip. A. Kolpinskogo, 1902.

Stites, Richard, "M.L. Mikhailov and the Emergence of the Woman Question in Russia," Canadian Slavic Studies, III, No. 2 (Summer 1969), 178-99.

_____, The question of the emancipation of women in nineteenth century Russia, Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1968.

Theen, Rolf H., "The Political Thought of P.N. Tkachev in the 1860's: From Reform to Revolution," Canadian Slavic Studies, III, No. 2 (Summer 1969), 200-23.

Turgenev, I.S., Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem v dvadtsati vos'mi tomakh: Sochineniia, Vol. XIV. Moskva: AN SSSR, 1967.

_____, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem v dvadtsati vos'mi tomakh: Pis'ma, Vol. IV. Moskva: AN SSSR, 1962.

Van der Eng, J., Dostoevskij Romancier. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1957.

Waliszewski, K., A History of Russian Literature. Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1969.

Yarmolinsky, Avrahm, The Russian Literary Imagination. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1969.